

The Classical Review

MARCH 1903.

THE TRUE MEANING OF THE *Κοινή*.

It has recently become the fashion among classical students to designate the colloquial Greek of post-classical and Graeco-Roman antiquity by the term *κοινή* and brand or conceive it as *vulgar Greek*: 'lingua corruptissima,' 'corrupta graecitas,' 'lingua franca,' 'Jargon,' and the like. True, within the last few years, a reaction has set in as regards the *character* of this much despised form of Greek, but the doubtful designation by the strange term *κοινή* is still in vogue, having even attained almost universal acceptance especially through the publications of Hatzidakis, Thumb, Dieterich, Schweitzer, and Kretschmer, who speak rather loosely of a *Koine* and even a *Koinisierung* assuming these notions to be well defined and familiar to all. As nearly all other classical students follow the fashion, and as I have myself fallen into the mistake by copying the term *κοινή* in my Historical Greek Grammar (p. 6), I feel bound to confess and rectify my error and at the same time explain for the benefit of other fellow-sinners that a critical examination of the question has convinced me that a *κοινή* language, as now styled and described, never had a concrete real existence or place in Greek written composition.

Classical scholars are well aware that, when speaking of their language, the Greeks never considered the vernacular or colloquial speech of their time. Unlike modern philologists and grammarians who lay down the rules and principles of language in 'speaking and writing,' the ancients ignored the spoken language with its winged

or passing words, and had regard exclusively to the *written* language, especially to that received or artistic form of language which had attained permanent and honourable place in literature. When national Greek history and literature had entered the period of decline, the then Greeks looked back to the glorious ancestral times, and with a sad pride referred to the language of their great ancestors with the reverential terms *παλαιά*, *ἀρχαία*, *δόκιμος*, *ἔνδοξος*, and the like, thus contradistinguishing it from their own (written) language, now styled *μεταγενεστέρα*, which suffered from such new accretions and elements as appeared *ἰδιώματα*, *νόθα*, *ἔκφυλα*, *ἀμαθῆ*, *ἰδιωτικά*, *βάρβαρα*, *σόλοικα*, and the like. On the whole, however, the Greeks at all times regarded their (written) language as an unbroken and homogeneous inheritance, and when they distinguished in it a *παλαιά* or *ἀρχαία* (classical) and a *μεταγενεστέρα* (post-classical), that distinction referred mainly to time and only indirectly to the character of the language.¹

Ignoring, then, systematically the spoken

¹ It is only casually and indirectly that we meet in ancient writings with an allusion to the vernacular speech of the time by such a designation as *ἰδιωτικὴ λέξις*, (*κοινή*) *συνήθεια*, or *χυδαία λαλιά*, etc.—In modern Greek this colloquial or illiterate form of speech is generally called *χλωσσα ἅπλῃ* or *λαλουμένη* or *δμιλουμένη*. The alternative designation as *καθωμιλουμένη* (adopted by Prof. Kretschmer and applied to the speech of the Hellenistic period) is a recent coinage of fastidious Greek scribes who overlook that *καθωμιλῶ* in the sense of 'I speak' is neither modern nor ancient Greek. Those who are not pleased with the term *δμιλουμένη* should at least adopt the form *καθωμιλημένη*.

or vernacular language of all times, the ancient Greeks knew and considered but one language, that which appeared in national literature. In this generally received language, however, and for literary purposes, they drew and emphasized a great distinction: the distinction between *dialectal* and *non-dialectal* Greek. With them DIALECTAL Greek was that particular vocabulary and diction which appeared as peculiar to one or more of the dialects (Aeolic, Doric, Ionic, Attic, also poetic), whereas by NON-DIALECTAL Greek they understood that wider part of the language which was 'common to all Greek dialects.' This common good, this universal or panhellenic Greek, they designated by the appropriate term *κοινή διάλεκτος*, the language common to all Greeks, and regarded it as the basis and norm (*μήτηρ ἢ κοινή* sc. *διάλεκτος*, Schol. in Dion. Thr. 469, 6, ed. A. Hilgard, 1901), by which all writers had to abide. The best type of this *κοινή διάλεκτος* they found in the Attic orators, and Dionysios of Halicarnasos singles out Isocrates as the best representative of this standard or *κοινή διάλεκτος*.

1. KOINH DIALEKTOΣ (not *κοινή* without *διάλεκτος*): the καθαρεύουσα: the literary standard language as illustrated in the Attic orators, i.e. pure and free from all dialectal (and poetical) elements: Dion. Hal. de Isocr. § 2: 'Ἡ δὲ λέξις (i.e. style) ἢ κέχρηται (Ἰσοκράτης) τοιοῦτόν τινα χαρακτήρα ἔχει καθαρά μὲν ἐστὶν οὐχ ἥττον τῆς Ἀυσίου καὶ οὐδὲν εἰκὴ τιθεῖσα, τὴν τε διάλεκτον ἀκριβοῦσα ἐν τοῖς πάντι τὴν κοινήν καὶ συνηθεστάτην. καὶ γὰρ αὕτη πέφενγεν ἀπηρχαιωμένων καὶ σημειωδῶν ὀνομάτων τὴν ἀπειροκαλίαν καὶ κέκραται συμμέτρως, τό τε σαφὲς ἐκείνη παραπλήσιον ἔχει καὶ τὸ ἐναργές, ἥθικὴ τέ ἐστὶν καὶ πιθανή. Cp. also Id. de Lys. § 2 κατὰ τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τὸ μέρος, ὅπερ ἐστὶν πρῶτον καὶ κυριώτερον ἐν λόγοις, λέγω δὲ τὸ καθαρεύειν τὴν διάλεκτον, οὐθεὶς τῶν μεταγενεστέρων αὐτὸν (i.e. τὸν Ἀυσίαν) ὑπερβάλετο· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μιμήσασθαι πολλοὶ δύναμιν ἔσχον, ὅτι μὴ μόνος Ἰσοκράτης. καθαρώτατος δὴ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ γε Ἀυσίαν ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν οὗτος ἐμοί γε δοκεῖ γενέσθαι ὁ ἀνὴρ. id. § 3 τίς δὲ ἐστὶν (ἢ ἀρετὴ) αὕτη; ἢ διὰ τῶν κυρίων τε καὶ κοινῶν καὶ ἐν μέσῳ κειμένων ὀνομάτων ἐκφέρουσα τὰ νοούμενα. id. de Isocr. § 13 τοῖς κυρίοις καὶ συνήθεσι καὶ κοινοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀμφοτέροι (Ἰσοκράτης καὶ Ἀυσίας) κέχρηται.

Clem. Al. Strom. i, 146 (38) φασὶ δὲ οἱ Ἕλληνας διαλέκτους εἶναι τὰς παρὰ σφίσι πέντε, Ἀθηδα Ἰάδα Δωριδα Αἰολίδα, καὶ

πέμπτην τὴν κοινήν.—Schol. in Dion. Thr. 14, 14 διάλεκτοι δὲ εἰσι πέντε Ἀθῆς Δωρὶς Αἰολίς Ἰᾶς καὶ κοινή. καὶ Ἀθῆς ἢ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, Δωρὶς ἢ τῶν Δωριέων, Αἰολίς ἢ τῶν Αἰολέων, Ἰᾶς ἢ τῶν Ἰώνων, κοινή ἢ πάντες (the writers) χρώνται. So too 100, 38, 155, 33, 302, 2, 309, 28: πόσαι διάλεκτοι; πέντε, Ἰᾶς ἡγουν ἢ τῶν Ἰώνων . . . καὶ κοινή ἢ τι νὺ πάντες χρώμεθα (which all of us writers use). So further 567, 38, 411, 3, 431, 3, 463, 24: τὴν δὲ κοινήν (διάλεκτον) ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων λέγουσι πεποιθῆσθαι, κακῶς. καὶ γὰρ Ὅμηρος τέτταρσι χρεῖται, καὶ οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο κοινή ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ ἢ διάλεκτος. 469, 1 ff. περὶ κοινῆς (διαλέκτου). τινὲς φασιν ὅτι οὐκ ὀφείλει κοινή καλεῖσθαι ἀλλὰ μικτή, εἴπερ ἢ κοινή ἀπὸ τεσσάρων συνίστηται. οὐ γὰρ τὴν διὰ τεσσάρων φαρμάκων ἔμπλαστον κοινήν καλοῦμεν ἀλλὰ μικτήν.¹ καὶ καλῶς ἔλεγον ταῦτα πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας τὴν κοινήν συνίστασθαι ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ὅτι μήτηρ ἢ κοινή. εἰ γὰρ τις εἴποι ὅτι Δωριστί, φάμεν ὅτι τὸ κοινὸν αὐτοῦ ἢ Αἰολιστί ὁμοίως, ἢ Ἰαστί ἢ Ἀττικιστί. καὶ τὴν μὲν ἡμέραν <τῆμεραν> οἱ κοινοὶ λέγουσιν, οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ἔως, οἱ Ἰωνες ἡῶς, οἱ Δωριεῖς ἰῶς, οἱ Αἰολεῖς αῶς· καὶ μελισσῶν μελισσῶν μελισσῶν. 563, 20 τοῦτων δὲ (τῶν ἐπιρρημάτων) τὰ μὲν ἐστὶ ποιητικά, τὰ δὲ τῆς κοινῆς διαλέκτου. Gregorios of Corinth 11 (ed. Schaefer) κοινή δὲ ἢ πάντες χρώμεθα . . . ἡγουν ἢ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων συνεστῶσα Et. M. (ed. Gaisford) 21, 7 ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι κατὰ τὴν κοινήν διάλεκτον τὰ ἀπαθὴ οὐ λέγεται, οἷον τὸ πατέρος καὶ μητέρος καὶ ἀνέρος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πεπονθότα, οἷον τὸ πατρός. 760, 20 καὶ τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ (προσώπῳ) τύψεια χρώνται οἱ Αἰολεῖς, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς προσώποις (τύψειας τίψει) ἢ κοινή συνήθεια καὶ διάλεκτος. ὡσαύτως καὶ τῷ τρίτῳ τῶν πληθυντικῶν.—327, 30:

¹ Johannes Philoponos (in ed. Aldus Manutius' Thesaurus of 1496, fol. 286 f.) οἱ μὴ βουλούμενοι τὴν κοινήν καταριθμεῖν διάλεκτον ταῖς προειρημέναις τέσσαρσιν, αἰτιῶνται τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ οὐδὲν γὰρ, φασίν, ἔχει ἴδιον, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τετραφάρμακος δύναμις ἐκ τεσσάρων συνεστῶσα τετραφάρμακος λέγεται, οὐδὲν ἴδιον ἔχουσα, οὕτω καὶ ἡ κοινή διάλεκτος, ἐκ τεσσάρων συναρμωσθεῖσα, οὐκ ὀφείλει συναριθμεῖσθαι ταύταις. τῶν δὲ τὴν κοινήν διάλεκτον εἰσηγησάμενων οἱ μὲν λέγουσιν ὅτι πάσαις συμβέβληται ταῖς διαλέκτοις τοῖς ὁμοφάνοις, οἷον φίλος νῦν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα· οἱ δὲ ὅτι νῦν [οὐκ] ἐστὶν ἔχουσα τύπον, ἀλλ' ἐκ διαφόρων λέξεων συνηθροισμένη, μεταπτώσεις δὲ αὐτῆς οὐχ εὐρίσκονται . . . διάλεκτοι δὲ εἰσι, εἰ καὶ τὴν κοινήν τις καταριθμῇ, πέντε· Ἰᾶς Ἀθῆς Δωρὶς Αἰολίς κοινή· ἢ γὰρ πέμπτη ἴδιον οὐκ ἔχουσα χαρακτῆρα κοινήν ὠνομάσθη ἥτις ἐστὶ τοῖς κοινοῖς τῶν πασῶν χαρακτῆρσι χρεῖται καὶ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων καθίστηται ἢ ὅτι κοινῶς αὕτη πάντες χρώνται, ἢ διότι ἐκ ταύτης ἀρχονται, ὡς ταύτης οὕσης πάσαι.

ἐλεῶ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς πρώτης συζυγίας τῶν περισπωμένων [i.e. ἐώ], ἐλεῖς ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐλεεῖ καὶ δανείξει δὲ δίκαιος. κατὰ δὲ τὴν κοινὴν [?] δευτέρας [i.e. ᾠω] καὶ γίνεταί παρὰ τὸ ἔλεος, τοῦτο δὲ παρὰ τὸ λῶ, τὸ θέλω.

2. ΟΙ ΚΟΙΝΟΙ: the καθαρεύοντες prose writers, those who write in the κοινὴ διάλεκτος: see above under 1. Schol. in Dion. Thr. 469, 1 ff. (also quoted above under 1).—Et. M. 405, 23 οἱ Ἀττικοὶ χθές, οἱ δὲ κοινοὶ ἐχθές. 692, 13 ὅπερ (πρῶτ) οἱ μὲν ποιηταὶ βαρύνουσιν, οἷον ᾽πρῶτ δ' ὑπὲρ τοῖς σὺν τεύχεσιν, οἱ δὲ κοινοὶ καὶ Ἀττικοὶ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ὀξύνουσιν.

3. ΚΟΙΝΟΣ: common to all dialects represented in literature, commonly shared by all classical prose writers; hence non-dialectal, panhellenic, national, classical. Apoll. D. de Pron. 4, 19 (263A) τὸ μὲν ὄνομα οὐ κοινόν, τὸ δὲ ὄνομα. Schol. in Dion. Thr. 93, 11 εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ προθέσεις ἅσαι ὀκτωκαίδεκα, προστιθέναι δεῖ καὶ ἐνταῦθα κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος, ἢ ἢ οὕτως. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπον ἐπεὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ εὐρίσκομεν τὴν παλαιὰ κατὰ ὑπερ ἐνὶ δὲ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖως προστιθέναι κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος. 155, 33 ἢ οὐκί λέξις Ἰωνικὴ ἐστίν, οὐ κοινὴ... πᾶσαι αἱ προθέσεις μονοσυλλαβῶς λεγόμεναι... Ἰωνικαὶ εἰσὶ, κοινὰ δὲ γεγόνασιν ταῖς προσθηκαῖς τῶν φωνηέντων. οἱ γὰρ Ἰῶνες πάρθεσαν καὶ κάτθεσαν καὶ ἀνέθεσαν ἡμεῖς δὲ παρέθεσαν καὶ κατέθεσαν καὶ ἀνέθεσαν. 188, 31 τὸ φυράσω καὶ τὸ περάσω καὶ τὸ δράσω οὐ Δωρικὰ ὄντα ἀλλὰ κοινὰ μακρῷ τῷ ᾠ κέρηται. 279, 10 τὸ εἶθε κοινόν, τὸ δὲ αἶθε Δωριον. 366, 32 λέγει τοῖνυν ὁ τεχνικὸς χαρακτήρας καὶ τύπους τῶν πατριωνυμικῶν τρεῖς κοινὸν μὲν πάσης διαλέκτου τὸν εἰς -δης, οἷον Πηλείδης, Ἰωνικὸν δὲ τὸν εἰς -ων, οἷον Ἀτρείων, καὶ τρίτον τῶν Αἰολέων τὸν εἰς -άδιος, κτλ. So also 368, 13. 432, 22 εἰσὶ δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν οἱ διαzeugτικοὶ (σύνδεσμοι) τρεῖς, ἢ, ἦτοι, ἡέ. εἰσὶ δὲ τούτων τῶν διαzeugτικῶν οἱ μὲν ποιητικοί, οἱ δὲ πεζοί, οἱ δὲ κοινοί (common to both as ἢ, ἦτοι). So also 288, 1—Et. M. 272, 12 οὐδέποτε τὰ εἰς -κω ῥήματα κοινὰ ὄντα διφθόγγῃ τῇ διὰ τοῦ ἰ παραλήγεται ὅθεν ἐπιμεμπτος Ἀρίσταρχος τὸ αἶκε σε τῷ εἰσκοντες, διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφων, δεῖον διὰ τοῦ ἰ, πρόσκειται κοινὰ διὰ τὰ Αἰολικά. οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς θναῖσκω καὶ μμναῖσκω διὰ τῆς αἰ διφθόγγου λέγουσιν.¹

¹ Compare also Moiris the Atticist who, writing in the interest of the purely Attic dialect, contradistinguishes from it as κοινὸν or panhellenic the stock common to all the dialects, including Attic, and as Ἑλληνικὸν or Hellenic the stock common to all the dialects except Attic. ἀνακῶς Ἀττικοί, ὡς Πλάτων δ' κωμικοῖς. καὶ τὰς θύρας ἀνακῶς

4. ΚΟΙΝΩΣ:² like κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος, as generally received, as used in the κοινὴ διάλεκτος, Moiris: ξυμφώνως Ἀττικοί, συμφώνως Ἑλληνες καὶ κοινῶς. Schol. in Dion. Thr. 112, 12 ἐκ τούτου αὐτὸς καὶ βανός, ὅπερ κοινῶς μὲν ὀξύνεται, Ἀττικῶς δὲ βαρύνεται. 541, 13 τῶν διὰ τοῦ -εας τινὰ συναίρεται Δωρικῶς, Ἑρμῆας Ἑρμᾶς, Βορέας Βορᾶς, κοινῶς δὲ Ἀπελλῆς.—So also ΚΟΙΝΟΤΕΡΩΣ (in a more general way) Schol. in Dion. Thr. 151, 23, ἢ γὰρ δεκάς δεχᾶς ἂν κοινότερως ῥηθείη ὅτι τοὺς πρὸ αὐτῆς ῥηθέντας ἀριθμούς μεθ' ἑαυτὴν λεγομένους δέχεται καὶ συναλείται αὐτοῖς. ib. 34 οὕτω τὸν δέκα δέχα εἰποῖς κοινότερως ὡς δεκτικὸν τῶν ἄλλων.

5. ΚΟΙΝΟΛΕΚΤΕΙΣΘΑΙ: to be common to some or all dialects, to be used in pure classical non-dialectal prose: Apoll. D. de Pron. 92, 20 (378 B) αἱ πληθυντικά (ἀντωνυμῖαι) κοινολεκτοῦνται κατ' εὐθείαν πρὸς τὴν Ἰωνικὴν καὶ Ἀττικὴν ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς σφέεις. Id. de Adv. 169, 20 (580, 30) τὰ εἰς -ως λήγοντα ἐπιρρήματα κοινολεκτοῦμενα δυσὶ τόνοις ὑποπίπτει ἢ γὰρ βαρύνεται, ὡς κούφως φαύλως μετρίως ἢ περισπᾶται, ὡς τὸ σεμνῶς καὶ εἰσεβῶς. Et. M. 189, 39 τὰ εἰς -ους λήγοντα ἀρσενικά, εἴτε μονοσύλλαβα εἴτε ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς, ἅπαντα ὀξύνεται, δηλονότι κοινολεκτοῦμενα, βασιλεῖς Ἀχλλεύς Πηλεῖς κτλ. πρόσκειται κοινολεκτοῦμενα, οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς βαρυτόνους λέγουσιν Ἀχίλλεος Πήλεος. 304, 51 τὰ εἰς -εις ὀνόματα μὴ κοινολεκτοῦμενα ἔχοντα οὐδέτερον παρασχηματισμὸν ἀποστρέφεται τὴν ὀξείαν

ἔχειν. ἀσφαλῶς ἢ φυλακτικῶς κοινόν. ἀτεχνῶς Ἀττικοί, ἀπλῶς κοινόν. βιβλία διὰ τοῦ ἰ, ὡς Πλάτων, Ἀττικοί. βυβλία, ὡς Δημοσθένης, κοινόν. γλαῦσος Ἀττικοί, ληῦσος κοινόν ἀμφότερα. γόης Ἀττικοί, κόλαξ Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ κοινόν. δευσοποιοί Ἀττικοί, βαφεῖς κοινόν. διῆρες Ἀττικοί, ὑπερφῶν κοινόν. ἐξέλλειν Ἀττικοί, ἐξείργειν Ἑλληνες, ἐκβάλλειν κοινόν (common to all). εἰ γὰρ Ἀττικοί, εἴθε γὰρ κοινόν. ἡρεσέ με Ἀττικοί, ἡρεσέ μοι κοινόν. ἦττω Ἀττικοί, ἦσσαν κοινόν. ἱτρία (πλάσματα λεπτὰ σησάμη πεπλασμένα) λάγανα κοινόν. ἰσασιν Ἀττικοί, οἰδασιν κοινόν. Ἀττικοί, κᾶθησο Ἀττικοί, κᾶθου κοινόν. λέμμα ἀντὶ τοῦ λέπις Ἑλληνες, λέπος κοινόν. μαχαιρίδες (αἱ μάχαιραι τῶν κοινῶν) Ἀττικοί, μάχαιραι κοινόν. νεάτων Ἀττικοί, ἔσχατων κοινόν. οἶσε Ἀττικοί, φέρε Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ κοινόν. ποῖ Ἀττικοί, ποῦ κοινόν. ῥιγῶν Ἀττικοί, ῥιγούν κοινόν, ῥιγούν Ἑλληνες. σκιάς Ἀττικοί, ἀναδενδράς κοινόν. σπᾶδων κοινόν, εὐνοῦχος Ἑλληνες. σμικρὸν Ἀττικοί, μικρὸν κοινόν. φειδῶλοι Ἀττικοί, σκνιφοί [σκινοποῖ] κοινόν. ὦδε κοινόν ἰώνων Ἀττικῶν, οὕτως Ἑλληνες.

² Compare Sext. 608, 17 γραμματικὴ τοῖνυν λέγεται κατὰ δημοτυμίαν κοινῶς τε καὶ ἰδίως. καὶ κοινῶς μὲν ἢ τῶν ὁποιωνδήποτε γραμμάτων εἰδησις, ἐὰν Ἑλληνικῶν ἐὰν τε βαρβαρικῶν, ἢν συνήθως γραμματικὴν καλοῦμεν, ἰδιαίτερον δὲ ἢ ἐντελής καὶ τοῖς περὶ Κράττητα τὸν Μαλλώτην Ἀριστοφάνην τε καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον ἐκπονηθεῖσα.

τάσιν, ὀνόματα δὲ εἶπεν (sc. ὁ τεχνικός) τὰς μετοχάς, οἷον τυφθεῖς· κοινολεκτούμενα δὲ εἶπε διὰ τὸ εὐγενὲς καὶ εὐσεβές· οἱ γὰρ Βοιωτοὶ διὰ τῆς εἰς διφθόγγου γράφουσιν. 737, 25 τὰ εἰς -ζω λήγοντα ῥήματα κοινολεκτούμενα οὐδέποτε ἔχει τὸ α ἐν τῇ παραληγουσῇ μακρὸν φύσει...πρόσκειται κοινολεκτούμενα, ἐπειδὴ τὸ πλῆσσω πλάζω λέγουσιν οἱ Δωριεῖς, καὶ ἔστι τὸ α φύσει μακρόν.

But there is no need of accumulating further proofs of what is already too manifest. Wherever the ancients refer to the κοινὴ διάλεκτος they always mean that national literary Greek which is free from all dialectal and even poetical admixture, a form of style best represented in the orators. It is in this sense also that the older of modern philologists and grammarians understood the term κοινὴ διάλεκτος. Thus in his famous Phalaris (ed. W. Wagner 402 f.) Bentley says: 'The general manner of speech call'd κοινὴ διάλεκτος, *The Common Dialect*, which the writers [before and] after Alexander's time commonly used, was never at any time or in any place the popular idiom; but perfectly a language of the

learned.' Still more explicit and marvelously correct is the definition given to the κοινὴ διάλεκτος by the great philologist and sound grammarian Fr. Thiersch, when he says in his *Greek Grammar* (ed. of 1830, Engl. by D. K. Sandford) p. xvii: 'In the universal language to which the Attic dialect was raised, a distinction was however drawn between some forms peculiar to Attica and others in general usage. Hence the opposition of one part as Attic (Ἀττικόν) to the other as Common (κοινόν). *The universal language—or common dialect—is assumed as the basis of Greek grammars*'. Then p. xix 'The selection of that which is common to the Attic and the other dialects constitutes the *Common dialect*.'

How we modern students have come to lose sight of all tradition and thus misapply the term κοινὴ (διάλεκτος) to post-classical demotic or vernacular speech, a form of language systematically ignored by the ancients, is a phenomenon hardly creditable to the exact and critical scholarship of our times.

A. N. JANNARIS.

ON THE ORIGINAL CONCLUSION OF THE Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Μενελάου Μονομαχία.

PERHAPS no episode in the Iliad suffers from a more 'lame and impotent conclusion' than the duel between Menelaos and Paris. Paris challenges Menelaos to single combat: an agreement is made that the victor shall have Helen and all the goods that came with her to Troy, and the agreement is ratified by a sacrifice: they fight; and when Paris is on the point of being worsted he is rescued by Aphrodité and taken off by supernatural means to Helen's chamber, while Menelaos is left wandering on the field in search of his antagonist. Agamemnon comes forward to claim the reward of the victory on his brother's behalf, the Achaeans assent to the claim, and—no more is heard of the matter so far as the persons chiefly interested are concerned. The way in which the whole episode is apparently forgotten, but for a few stray references to the subsequent treachery of Pandaros, is one of the most striking facts in the Iliad.

Robert (Studien zur Ilias) treats the difficulty in drastic fashion. He regards the duel-episode as an *Einzellied*, ending

with the scene in Helen's chamber (II. iii, 447): the remaining lines of the book are an attempt, (a clumsy attempt, one must admit) to fit the episode into the framework of the Iliad: Menelaos (according to Robert) was only a secondary figure; the whole interest centres in Paris: 'Was aus Menelaos wird, fragt der Hörer nicht und soll er nicht fragen' (*op. cit.* p. 208). Surely there is some other way out of the difficulty than this.

Let us see what the points are that call for explanation. (1) What reply have the Trojans to give to Agamemnon's demand for the restitution of Helen in accordance with the oaths? There seems to be no consciousness in their minds when, after the scene in Olympus with which Book 4 opens, we are transported by the poet to the Trojan host, that any reply is called for. (2) What attitude towards Pandaros do the Trojans assume considering that (according to iii, 453) they would gladly have seen Paris killed and, presumably, the war ended? We must find some answer to these questions if we are not to assume some

botching on the part of the poet or the 'redactor' or some lacuna in the poem.

On turning to the second duel in the Iliad, that between Hektor and Aias in Book 7, we find the question of the restoration of Helen crop up again, in a manner for which nothing in the Iliad between the end of Book 3 and the end of Nestor's speech in Book 7 (l. 343) has in the least prepared us. The idea that vii. 344 *sqq.* are the immediate sequel to Book 3 is too obvious to have escaped notice, but I cannot find that it has been worked out before.

Hektor and Aias after a stubborn fight have parted in amity and retired to their comrades' welcoming arms. Nestor in the midst of the rejoicing proposes to build a wall round the camp: the Trojans in a threatening and scolding crowd surround Priam's palace and Antenor, in a speech to the closing lines of which we shall have to pay close attention in a moment, proposes to surrender Helen. Paris refuses to give up 'the woman,' but will give 'the goods': Priam intervenes and suggests an embassy to the Greek camp in the morning: the heralds go on their errand and return with an uncompromising reply but with the permission they had craved for to burn the bodies of the dead.

Here several questions suggest themselves: why are the Trojans threatening and noisy (*ἀγορή*. . . *δεινὴ τετραρχία*, vii, 346)? why is the proposal to surrender Helen made at this point in the action? why does Antenor take such a prominent part? These questions are not easy to answer on the supposition that the scene belongs to the place in which we find it, but are lucidity itself if we suppose that the episode came originally immediately after the conclusion of Agamemnon's speech at the end of Book 3. The Trojans are angry that Paris, to whom they bear no good will, should have by his escape so complicated matters that no one can say whether he or Menelaos was really the victor: and Antenor takes part because he had been the only Trojan who had actually assisted Priam at the conclusion of the truce: his proposal to restore Helen is made, because he looks on Paris as the vanquished, and as bound to restore her by the terms of truce. Note also how Paris seems to have an uneasy consciousness that he should restore something: he is bound either to give up Helen and her property if beaten, or, if not beaten, nothing: he tries to strike a bargain between his conscience and his greed: he will give 'the

goods' and some of his own property as well. The last lines of Antenor's speech are worth studying.

δεῦτ' ἄγετ', Ἀργείην Ἑλένην καὶ κτήμαθ' ἅμ'
αὐτῇ
δώμεν Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἄγειν· νῦν δ' ὄρκια πιστὰ
ψευδάμενοι μαχόμεσθα· τῷ οὐ νύ τι κέρδιον
ἡμῖν
ἔλπομαι ἐκτελέεσθαι, ἵνα μὴ βέβομεν ὦδε.

Aristarchus rejected the last line and rightly so when we regard the preceding one. But how did it get in? It is generally regarded as an adscript to complete the construction of the preceding—in need of no such help. Now the preceding line refers to the events lying between the end of Book 3 and this speech. What if *it* be the intruder, added when this speech was transferred from its original context to the present place? Suppose Antenor ended

νῦν [δ'] ὄρκια πιστὰ
ἔλπομαι ἐκτελέεσθαι ἵνα μὴ βέβομεν αὐτως

'Now I look for our trusty oaths to be performed that we may not have done sacrifice for naught,' all will run smoothly and as we should expect under the circumstances (*αὐτως* might readily become *οὕτως* and so *ὦδε*—perhaps might even have been changed on purpose. For the variants see Leaf's critical note: and for the use of the aor. subjunctive by a 'laxity of usage' for the perfect cf. Goodwin *M.T.* § 93).

Now here we find some curious points of resemblance between the two passages: in the first place Priam and Antenor, who negotiated the oaths in Book 3 appear again, and evidently as persons who have some special right to be heard: the feeling against Paris which is so prominent in the conclusion of Book 3 re-appears as it does nowhere else except in Book 6 in the much-discussed *μήνις* Ἀλεξάνδροιο (see vii. 390, 393, the Trojans regard Paris as beaten and bound by the terms of the truce to restore Helen). Let any one read iii. 448—461 followed immediately by vii. 345 *sqq.* and the conclusion that they form part of the same scene will be forced on him irresistibly.

How then did they become separated? I offer a suggestion for what it is worth. The scene in which Aphroditē brings Helen to her chamber and that in which Paris meets her there, did not belong to the original cast of this episode. The latter certainly cannot: for the assembly at Priam's gate must have taken place immedi-

ately after the conclusion of the duel: Paris takes part in it: and yet he must on the other hypothesis have been just then dallying in his lady's chamber. The chamber-scene was perhaps composed to explain why Paris is found there by Hektor in Book 6. But when it *was* composed, its incompatibility with the original ending of the episode became apparent and the 'editor,' or whoever is responsible for the present form of the Iliad, transferred the latter to the conclusion of the second duel, forgetting that this was undertaken purely ἐξ ἐριδος, and without any condition being attached to the victory. Our point (2) above, about Pandaros, answers itself: he and his treachery retire from the original poem, as indeed they had been forced to do for other reasons long ago.

There is one slight difficulty remaining. It is Diomedes, not, as might be expected, Menelaos who gives the answer to the Trojan heralds (vii. 399). Menelaos, as we see from iii. 397, was not likely to allow this. Considering the way in which Diomedes, according to Robert, has been foisted wherever possible into the Iliad we

need not wonder if Διομήδης has taken the place of Μενέλαος in vii. 399 and Διομήδεος ἱπποδάμοιο that of Μενελάου Ἀτρεΐδαο in vii. 404.

If these conclusions be accepted, a great deal of light is thrown upon Paris' anger in Book 6 when Hektor finds him sulking in Helen's chamber. He determines to fight no more for such ingrates. 'Call you this backing of your friends? A plague on such backing, I say.'

R. M. HENRY.

BELFAST, Jan., 2, 1903.

P.S.—It was not till this paper was already in type that I saw Erhardt's remarks on vii. 344 *sqq.* (Die Entstehung der Homerischen Gedichte, pp. 98 *sqq.*) He regards them as of importance for explaining Paris' attitude in Book 6, and as coming originally before that book as the sequel to the duel in Book 3: but he does not work out the connection fully, and indeed his retention of vii. 351 forbids a very close sequence.

TWO UNPUBLISHED INSCRIPTIONS FROM HERODOTUS.

THE purpose of this paper is to prove, in two cases of special interest, the truth of a proposition which, taken generally, is not likely to be disputed; that Herodotus depended, for some part of his many statements and anecdotes of which the source is not obvious, upon the evidence of public monuments. That he was a diligent visitor of the places where such monuments were collected is as plain, in all parts of his work, as that he was not an explorer of archives, not even of such modest repositories as certainly existed and were accessible in his time. Explicit reference to the monuments, and professed quotation, we should not expect from him; it would be inconsistent with the tone and manner of his narrative. But for all that, it may be possible in some instances to trace his proceedings and recover his documents, as we may see from the parallel case of the treatment which he applies to literature.

To quote poetry for decorative purposes formally and openly, after the fashion of Cicero and Plutarch and generally of all writers accustomed to libraries, is not the

practice of Herodotus nor suitable to his colouring. Yet not only is it visible that, in the treatment of topics which are akin to popular poetry, he is profoundly influenced by it both in thought and style; but not unfrequently it will be seen, upon closer inspection, that his imitations are, in all but form, quotations, the poetical material being reproduced so exactly that we can with ease reverse the composer's process and restore the verses which he has turned into prose. For example, when he writes (8.3),

ἀντιβάντων δὲ τῶν συμμαχῶν, εἶκον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, μέγα πεποιημένοι περιεῖναι τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καὶ γνόντες, εἰ στασιάζουσιν περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίης, ὥς ἀπολέσται ἡ Ἑλλάς, ὁρθὰ νοεῖντες· στάσις γὰρ ἐμφυλὸς πολέμου ὁμοφρονέοντος τοσούτῳ κἀκίον ἔστι, ὅσῳ πόλεμος εἰρήνης.

the change of style and vocabulary in the final sentence does not escape the ear, and the conjecture is obvious that this change is due to the imitation of a proverb in verse. But the truth is, that the very words of the gnomic poet are before us;

. . . ὁρᾷ νοεῖντες
εἰρήνης γὰρ ὅσῳ πόλεμος, τοσσῶδε κάκιον
ἔμφυλος πολέμου στάσις ἐστὶν ὁμοφρονέοντος.

Two entire hexameters has the historian consciously or unconsciously reproduced without the change of a syllable, except the necessary translation of *τοσσῶδε* into the corresponding prose-form *τοσούτω*. Nor is it only gnomie poetry proper which furnishes material for such treatment. The maxims of Attic tragedy are also susceptible of it. Thus in that banquet at Thebes, (9. 16), which is perhaps the most tragic in feeling of all incidents in the history, the Persian guest is made to express his useless foreknowledge of disaster in these terms:

Ξεῖνε, ὃ τι δὲ γενέσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ,
ἀμήχανον ἀποτρέψαι ἀνθρώπων· οὐδὲ γὰρ πιστὰ
λέγουσι ἐθέλει πείθεσθαι οὐδεὶς. ταῦτα δὲ
Περσέων συγχροὶ ἐπιστάμενοι ἐπόμεθα ἀναγκαίῃ
ἐνδεδεμένοι. ἐχθίστη δὲ ὁδὴν ἐστὶ τῶν ἐν
ἀνθρώποισι αὐτῇ, πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς
κρατεῖν.

Here those words which belong only to the special occasion, the sentence *ταῦτα δὲ . . . ἐνδεδεμένοι*, are genuine prose, original prose, which, like other such composition, cannot be converted into metre of any sort without changing the substance. But the general maxims, with which the speech begins and ends, are not such prose, as the very sound and feeling of them betrays. The second is a transcript of two verses from tragedy;

ὁδὴν δ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισι ἐχθίστη πέλει
αὐτῇ, φρονέοντα πολλὰ μηδενὸς κρατεῖν.

The *πέλει*, characteristic of the proverbial style in tragedy, Herodotus could not borrow, but must translate; nor could he dispense, like the poet, with the article *τῶν*. But so far as he possibly could, he borrows the very words, not shunning even the palpably poetical turn of the phrase *φρονέοντα πολλὰ*. Having seen this, we may fairly suspect that the preceding maxim also imitates poetry not only in tone (this is obvious) but in words; and the suspicion is confirmed, as the reader may ascertain, by the facility with which the sentence will run into hexameters.

Now such remarks, in themselves merely curious, point the way to possible observations of higher interest. Literature in whatever shape, dramas, tales, moralities, was not the only kind of metrical composition with which our historiographer was

familiar, nor the most nearly related to his purpose. The sacred places of Hellas were already full of monuments, interesting to the 'enquirer' and explained not unfrequently by inscriptions in metre. What we now see is this, that where Herodotus made use of such, as we may presume that he occasionally did, there is a likelihood, from his habits of composition, that we may learn from his work more than he designed to tell us. We may anticipate that a narrator, whose taste and memory prompted him to verbal fidelity in the adapting of mere decorations, will deal sometimes not less faithfully with verses which furnished the very foundation of his story. If so, he will supply us with an instrument of no small importance, especially in our dearth of such instruments, for criticising and estimating his method.

In his account of the battle of Plataea there is one incident, which both in the character of the facts and in the manner of telling presents a remarkable contrast to the rest of the narrative. For the most part, indeed everywhere else, that account is precisely such as from the means open to Herodotus we might expect it to be; it includes nothing, and pretends to no exactness, which may not fairly be accounted for by popular tradition. For example, while Herodotus claims to have, as he well might have, a clear and tolerably complete knowledge of the military movements on the Greek side, those on the Persian side are left vague and obscure. The story is made less intelligible, but more authentic, by a defect corresponding to the natural limits of his information. In few places is there any minuteness of detail, and in general only with regard to incidents which, like the parading of the corpse of Masistius or the mutiny of Amompharetus, must or might be widely known, and might therefore naturally be learnt by that sort of 'enquiry' which, in reference to transactions within memory, Herodotus seems to profess. One incident, and one only, is otherwise related, related with a fulness of detail such as could be really warranted only in an eye-witness; and this is the more remarkable, inasmuch as the particular fact is of such a nature, that at first sight we cannot easily imagine any probable way in which the details could be preserved.

When the Barbarians had been laid low by the Hellenes at Plataea, there approached to them a woman, the concubine of Phiarandates the son of Teaspis a Persian, coming of her own will from the enemy, who when she perceived that the Persians

had been destroyed and that the Hellenes were the victors, descended from her carriage and came up to the Lacedaemonians while they were yet among the slaughter. She had adorned herself with many ornaments of gold, and her attendants likewise, and had put on the fairest robe she had. And when she perceived that the director of all things there was 'Pausanias', being before well acquainted with his name and birth, which she had heard often, she knew him for who he was, and taking hold of his knees she said thus: 'O king of Sparta, deliver me thy suppliant from the slavery of the captive: for thou hast also done me service hitherto in destroying these, who have regard neither for demigod nor yet for god. I am a native of Cos, the daughter of Hegetorides son of Antagoras; and the Persian took me by force in Cos and kept me a prisoner.' He made answer thus: 'Woman, be of good courage, both for that thou art a suppliant and for that perchance thou speakest true, and art the daughter of Hegetorides the Coan, who is happily my best friend of all that dwell in those parts.' Having thus spoken, for the time he gave her in charge to those Ephors who were present, and afterwards sent her away to Aegina, whither she herself desired to go.¹

If we compare this story with the context, we must be sensible of the contrast above indicated, and shall see reason for asking why of this particular scene, concerning people of no importance and not otherwise mentioned, Herodotus assumes to be far more exactly informed than of anything else which passed upon the Plataean field. No other scene is presented with anything like this completeness of persons and properties; chariot, jewels, dress, attendants, ephors. That Herodotus thought himself at liberty to invent all this, no one, who will study at length his account of the battle and sequel, will easily suppose. From what witness then did he derive it? Not from any witness, but from a document, a document of which part, but a part only, was in writing and is reproduced by the historian with the utmost exactness compatible with his manner of using it. The speech of the rescued lady to Pausanias has been copied closely and carefully, word after word, from a version in five hexameters. Here is the original:²

ὦ βασιλεῦ Σπάρτης, λῦσαί μ' ἱκέτιν [δορι-
λήπτον]
δουλοσύνης. σὺ γὰρ ἐς τόδ' ὄνησας τοῖσδ'
ἀπολέσας,
τοὺς οὐθ' [ἡρώων], οὐ θεῶν ὅπιν [οὔτιν'] ἔχοντας.

¹ 9. 76; translation of G. C. Macaulay, slightly modified.

² The words in brackets are inferred from the text of Herodotus, but not found in it. In v. 3 τοὺς οὐτε δαιμόνων (Herodotus) points *prima facie* to τοὺς οὐ δαιμόνων. But it is doubtful whether, even for metrical convenience, δαιμόνων could be used at this date (circ. 475 B.C.): ἡρώων was suggested to me by Sir R. C. Jebb. Possible also are ἀντιθέων and ἡμιθέων: see L. and Sc. s. vv.

Κῶν δ' εἰμὶ γένος, θυγάτηρ Ἥγητορίδω
'Ανταγόρῳ: βίη δὲ λαβὼν Κῶ μ' εἶχεν ὁ Πέρσης.

And here is the transcript of Herodotus:

ὦ βασιλεῦ Σπάρτης, λῦσαί με τὴν ἱκέτιν
αἰχμαλώτου δουλοσύνης: σὺ γὰρ καὶ ἐς τόδε
ὤνησας τοῖσδε ἀπολέσας τοὺς οὔτε δαιμόνων
οὔτε θεῶν ὅπιν ἔχοντας. εἰμὶ δὲ γένος μὲν Κῶν,
θυγάτηρ δὲ Ἥγητορίδω τοῦ Ἀνταγόρου. βίη
δέ με λαβὼν ἐν Κῶ εἶχε ὁ Πέρσης.

It appears that *δοριλήπτον*, the only word not admissible in prose, has been translated (as *πέλα τοῖς* in the before-cited fragment of tragedy) into the precise equivalent *αἰχμαλώτου*, a translation which also effects a desirable object by obliterating the close of a hexameter. With the same purpose *οὔτινα* is dropped: in the other three verses the effect is accomplished, or rather accomplishes itself, by the mere substitution of the Herodotean forms for the epic. The epic locative *Κῶ* in the last verse becomes of course *ἐν Κῶ*; the less common term *ἥρω* is replaced by the normal *δαίμων*; the article (*τὴν* v. 1, *τοῦ* v. 5) is inserted where prose requires it and verse rejects; and a few additional conjunctions (*καί, τε, τε, μὲν, δέ*), natural to common speech, complete the disguise sufficiently. We notice however that the disguise is not quite perfect; for, as in the tragic proverb the poetical phrase *φρονῶν πολλά*, so here the poetical combination *αἰχμαλώτος δουλοσύνη* remains to a careful ear perceptible, though the narrator doubtless felt, and with reason, that in a scene of so much passion and pathos it would not offend. We may notice also, as a justification, if any were needed, for the historian's fidelity, that even this change of a word, necessary though it is, slightly obscures the connexion of the whole as framed by the original composer; for *δοριλήπτον* points forward to *λαβὼν* in the final verse, which the substituted *αἰχμαλώτου* does not.

Now upon observing this, we might at first suspect that the whole story is taken from an original in verse, a thing in itself by no means inconceivable or even improbable. But such is not the fact; for this speech is the only portion susceptible of such re-translation, a thing not otherwise to be naturally explained but by supposing that this, and this only, is a translation. We may try the experiment upon the preceding sentence:

ὄρωσα δὲ πάντα ἐκείνα διέποντα Πανσανίην,
πρότερόν τε τὸ οἶνομα ἐξεπισταμένη καὶ τὴν
πάτρην, ὥστε πολλὰκις ἀκούσασα, ἔγνων τε τὸν

Πανσανίην καὶ λαβομένη τῶν γονάτων ἔλεγε
τάδε—

where a very brief inspection will prove it impracticable. Even the reply of Pausanias, which might well be expected to follow the model, if model there were, exhibits such hopeless material as this—ὅς ἐμοὶ ξείνος μάλιστα τυγχάνει ἔδῶν τῶν περὶ ἐκείνους τοὺς χώρους οἰκημένων. The speech of the lady therefore, and nothing more, Herodotus had before him in hexameter verse; but this he derived from a source so authentic that he thought fit to preserve it textually. How to solve the problem so presented we shall not hesitate, when we note that the narrative, full as it is, contains nothing which would not be given by a picture of the principal situation, a picture in the Greek style, the lady upon her knees before the king, Persian corpses upon the ground (one of them named, Φαρανδάτης Τεάσιππος), two maids on the other (these also identified by their costume or by lettering), and the chariot for a background. Such a representation, drawn or in base-relief, with an inscription explaining its purport, the heroine of the story must have dedicated, in gratitude for her escape, at some temple in Aegina. Hence the historian is able to say that to Aegina she was sent; and we see that this is just all that he can tell of her subsequent adventures,—except indeed that Aegina was ‘whither she wanted to go,’ not an extravagant inference from the fact that thither she went. That the declarations of her speech, as inscribed, were the cause of Pausanias’ clemency is also a fair inference from the mention of them; and Herodotus accordingly expresses this in his usual manner, by a speech assigned to the king, which acknowledges the name of Hegetorides as one which especially appeals to him. As to this name however, the historian has followed a construction of the document which, were it not for his authority, would be disputable. He assumes that in the verses Ἡγγοριδαοῦ Ἀνταγόραο is the genitive of Ἡγγοριδῆς Ἀνταγόραο Hegetorides, son of Antagoras’, as of course it might be; and perhaps he knew of such a ‘Hegetorides’ otherwise. But he gives no sign of such knowledge; and as an interpretation of the document I should, I confess, have otherwise preferred ‘Antagoras, son of Hegetor’, taking ‘Hegetorides’ as a patronymic. Nor, as it is, should I absolutely discard this interpretation, although, or perhaps

because, it would curiously illuminate the king’s acquaintance with the name of ‘his best of friends.’ That he commended the lady to the ‘ephors’ is more certain; it would appear in the picture from his attitude. That Pharandates was the Persian captor Herodotus deduced, and properly, from the otherwise irrelevant assignment of that name to one of the corpses; and the place, Plataea, was indicated sufficiently by the name of the king. The rich attire of the suppliants was visible upon them, the ‘gold’ no doubt actually gilded, and we may go with Herodotus in supposing, all things considered, that it was ‘their best’. Nor need we object to his prudent and highly characteristic intimation, through the mouth of Pausanias, that the lady’s account of herself *may* have been more pathetic than true; Pausanias preferred the charitable assumption—εἰ δὴ πρὸς τούτῳ τυγχάνει ἀλθρεία λέγουσα.

At this same Aeginetan sanctuary, we may observe, Herodotus probably also learnt, from some pious *cicerone* commenting on a monument, the edifying story of the noble Aeginetan Lampon, which almost immediately follows (9. 78). It savours strongly of the preacher, and recalls the manner of Delphi.

The second instance is precisely similar. The description of the events which immediately followed the battle of Salamis, otherwise natural and probable, is interrupted (8. 114) by the astounding statement that the Spartans, receiving at this moment a command from Delphi ‘to demand of Xerxes satisfaction for the slaying of Leonidas, and to accept whatever the king should offer,’ actually despatched a herald with the commission, who, ‘taking the quickest way,’ overtook the retreating monarch ‘in Thessaly’ before he had parted from Mardonius, and delivered his message in the presence of both; whereupon Xerxes, ‘pointing to Mardonius, said that “here was the man who should give such satisfaction on the part of the Persians as the Lacedaemonians ought to receive”’—which in due course and to the glory of Apollo he did at Plataea.

The historical value of this anecdote is scarcely worth discussion. It has every mark of the apocryphal, improbabilities moral and physical, amounting almost to the impossible, vagueness and uncertainty in all the circumstances. Assuredly if any Greek had at this time beard the Great King, and returned to report the interview, it would not have been forgotten who was

the hero and where was the scene of this transcendent experience. What may be worth enquiry is the nature of the evidence upon which Herodotus, who about oracles in particular expressly claims to be reasonably, though not obstinately, critical, accepted a statement, the objections to which he did not overlook.¹

We have some light upon this question when we observe, that, while the rest of the anecdote was composed freely, so far as appears, by Herodotus, the speech of the herald, like that of the lady from Cos, was not so composed, but translated from verse,

ὦ βασιλεῦ Μήδων, Λακεδαιμόνιοί τε φόνοιο
αἰτεῦσίν σε δίκας Σπάρτης ἀπό θ' Ἡρακλεΐδαι,
Ἑλλάδα ῥυόμενόν σφιν ὅτι κτεῖνας βασιλῆα,

into prose,

ὦ βασιλεῦ Μήδων, Λακεδαιμόνιοί τέ σε καὶ
Ἡρακλεΐδαι οἱ ἀπὸ Σπάρτης αἰτέουσι φόνον
δίκας, ὅτι σφέων τὸν βασιλῆα ἀπέκτεινας ῥυό-
μενον τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

As there, so also here, the document is followed word for word. The possessive-dative (σφιν, in v. 3) might perhaps have been retained without offence; but with the prosaic arrangement and emphasis, the geni-

¹ Note the simple but significant suggestion that the herald took 'the quickest way'. It is uncertain whether Xerxes was then in Thessaly at all.

tive σφέων, answering to Μήδων, is more natural; the other changes are just the inevitable.

Here again therefore we have to do, not with a narrative in hexameters, but a fragment of a narrative, such a fragment as could hardly exist except as an inscription, as an explanatory appendage to a reciprocally illustrative work of art. From this work itself, the painted or sculptured group, comes the principal scene, Xerxes answering the herald by 'pointing to Mardonius', and the story from the religious custodians of it, the Delphians or whoever they were. But we may now divine how and by what stages this story grew and came to be accepted. It is open and natural to be supposed, that the authors of the work neither asserted nor intended it to represent an actual event. It was a symbol, legitimate and appropriate, of the truth that Plataea was the Spartan's revenge for Thermopylae. But when the exhibitors for obvious reasons preferred to regard and explain it as historical, it seemed, to a mind perfectly honest but not sufficiently versed in the sifting of such testimony, to be an independent witness. It produced upon Herodotus the sort of effect which upon persons not accustomed to analysis is now produced when something, which they are not unwilling to believe, is actually shown to them 'in print'.

A. W. VERRALL.

OF THE PROLOGUE OF *THE AGAMEMNON*.¹

THOUGH many scholars have handled the prologue of the *Agamemnon*, yet it may, I venture to think, be said without presumptuousness that they have left something still to be done in the elucidation and restoration of that small group of verses. It is to this task that I now address myself.

The proper interpretation of the prologue of the *Agamemnon* is far from simple. The right understanding of the character of the watcher, as Aeschylus has depicted it in words put in the watcher's mouth, is so bound up with questions about the text that the problem, What in general was the watchman meant by the poet to say? and the problem, How precisely did the poet make him express the thoughts attributed

to him? can never be fully separated in any proper discussion of this passage. To the way in which Aeschylus, in a few masterly strokes, has made the watcher depict his own character, Patin has drawn attention in the excellent remark² about 'l'esclave d'Eschyle, qui ne prononce que quelques vers et offre cependant tout l'intérêt d'un caractère dramatique'. I will now run the risk of begging certain textual questions and proceed to set forth in a few words the character of the watcher and his mental attitude in the prologue.

The man is at once anxious for his master's return and fearful of what may follow upon that return. He is thoroughly loyal to Agamemnon, whom he loves

¹ Read before the American Philological Association at Union College, Schenectady, 9 July, 1902.

² Patin's 'Eschyle' (in *Études sur les tragiques grecs*) p. 314, quoted approximately in Wecklein's German edition.

(v. 34 sq.); he fears Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus and mourns the evils of the house (vv. 14, 36 sq., 18 sq.). But his virtue is after all but the virtue of the faithful slave: his loyalty is alloyed with a regard for his own interests and his own comfort. Indeed, so prominent does he make his sense of the discomforts and the tediousness of his yearlong task that it would seem that readers of his words have generally been quite misled about the tenor of his speech. And this brings us at once to a question of the minute interpretation of the text.

If what has just been said of the state of mind of the watcher is true—and there is a begging of the question in my assuming above what a careful study of the text has seemed to me surely to yield—, if, I say, my analysis of the watcher's state of mind is just, then the *μέν* in v. 1 is concessive and its correlative is the *δέ* in v. 12. The man is indeed (*μέν*) praying for release from his irksome task by the beacon that shall announce his master's speedy return, but (*δέ*) mourns the evil plight of the house and dreads the future. This is the sum and substance of that part of the prologue which precedes the flare of the beacon on the neighbouring mountain; and this prelude thus falls into two halves of which the former consists of vv. 1-11, omitting the spurious v. 7. We will now examine certain portions of vv. 1-11.

A very important matter is the proper understanding of *καὶ νῦν* in v. 8. If we had to guess the general drift of what preceded the words *καὶ νῦν φυλάσσω* without having vv. 1-6 before us, we should certainly say that it must be either 'I have been doing something else than keeping watch for the beacon', or 'I have been keeping watch for a certain time'. Now we have vv. 1-6 before us, and we know that the former alternative is wrong. Where and how is the latter alternative expressed? The answer is that it is expressed in vv. 4-6. If we follow this line of interpretation, we should, I believe, come to see that *ἦν* in v. 2 has hitherto been wrongly construed and that vv. 2-8 are an elaboration of *φρουρὰς ἐρείας μῆκος ἦν φυλάσσω λαμπάδος τὸ σύμβολον*, the verb *φυλάσσω* having a double object, an effected and an affected. The ultimate construction of *ἦν* is, then, with *φυλάσσω*, the words *κοιμώμενος... δίκην* are parenthetical, and vv. 4-6 are = *πεφύλαχα χεῖμα καὶ θέρος*.¹ This is revolutionary, but

¹ *τοὺς φέροντας... αἰθέρι* I take with others to refer to the stars that mark by their rising and setting

it is, after all, only a matter of putting the commas in the right places.

I may note before taking up v. 12 sqq. that the spurious v. 7 would never have been inserted, had it been seen, as I venture to think it should have been, that the genitive *ἄστρον νυκτέρων* belongs quite as much to *τοὺς... δυνάστας* as to *ὁμήγυριν*. Furthermore, it may be, as Meineke and van Herwerden have suggested, that *ἀνδρόβουλον* should give place to *ἀνδρόλημον*.

In the sentence—or clause—that begins in v. 12 M. Henri Weil's first thoughts seem to me to have been entirely right, so far as vv. 12 and 16 are concerned. We should regard *ὅταν δ'* as resumptive and should restore *ἔχων* for *ἔχω*. We find again that a simple thought is elaborated in a rambling fashion (and we must not forget that it is a slave that is speaking) to the confusion of the line by line reader. All would have been clear to the audience as Aeschylus's actor rendered the verses. The simple thought is this: *εὐτ' ἂν δέ, νυκτί-πλαγκτον ἐνδροσόν τ' ἔχων | ἐννὴν, αἰδεῖν ἢ μινύρεσθαι δοκῶ*, and the fact that these words form two perfect trimeters makes me think that they represent very nearly Aeschylus's first draft on which he afterwards improved. The variation *εὐτ' ἂν—ὅταν* is characteristic of Greek style — and characteristic, too, in that the second synonyme is the commoner word. *ὅταν δ'*, it may be added, resumes the whole of *εὐτ' ἂν νυκτίπλαγκτον... ἐννὴν* and should be followed by a comma.

In the parenthetical words *ὀνείρους... ὕπνῳ* I can not convince myself that *ἐμὴν* is not what Aeschylus wrote. V. 1226 (*ἐμῶν φέρειν γὰρ χρὴ τὸ δούλιον ζυγόν*) is quite strikingly like v. 14, and Eur. *Med.* 793 (*τᾶμ' οὐτὶς ἔστιν ὅστις ἐξαιρήσεται*) also favours *ἐμὴν*. In this parenthesis it is also to be noted that *ἀνθ' ὕπνου* in v. 14 can not be what Aeschylus wrote; but I can not think that the *ἀντίπνοος* which Messrs. van Herwerden (*Exerc. Cr.*, p. 96) and Wecklein have proposed is certainly right. The word was rather, I fancy, *ἀντίος*, out of which and a clumsy explanatory *ὕπνου* the traditional reading could have arisen.

In v. 16 I fail to see why *δοκῶ* should not bear its ordinary sense of 'seeming.' 'Whenever', says the watcher, 'anyone that overhears me thinks I am trying to keep awake by turning a tune, I am really the changes of the seasons. See Wecklein's note *ad loc.* in his *Aeschylus Orestia*.

sobbing'. The expression, whether in the Greek or in this free rendering, is a perfectly natural one.

After v. 19, in which I would accept the substitution of *δεσποτινόμενον* for the traditional *διαπονουμένον*, v. 20 *sq.* follow rather abruptly. But that is not all. At the end of the prologue we find four verses (36-39) that have nothing to do with what immediately precedes them, that deal with the dark secrets of the house and that fit perfectly after v. 19. My opinion that vv. 36-39 were placed by Aeschylus after v. 19 coincides with that of Professor van Herwerden, who in his *Emendationes Aeschyleae* (*Jahrbh.* 10^{er} Suppl., 121 *sqq.*) writes thus (p. 132): 'Vss. 36-39 longe aptiorem locum nanciscuntur, si mecum transposueris statim post vs. 19, ubi custos tetigit tristem rerum conditionem. Quo facto et vocabula τὰ δ' ἄλλα habebunt quo referantur, et laetiora moesta exceperint ad finem orationis usque continuata.' I may add here that the *Nῦν δ'* in v. 20 forms a sort of *reditus ad propositum* and brings us around to the point of view of v. 1. Dramatically v. 20 *sq.* prepare the way for the appearance of the beacon.

But there are certain textual questions in vv. 38 and 39 that require attention. The looming of fire by night, as Aeschylus dwells upon it in this prologue, inevitably calls up the opening of Pindar's first *Olympian*; and must not Aeschylus himself have had those splendid verses in mind when he wrote those that we are now examining? Does not also a certain likeness in v. 39 to something else in Pindar, that striking phrase *φωρᾶντα σινεροῖσιν* which seems to have taken hold upon the subsequent poets (cf. Euripides's *εὐξέμετον ξινεροῖσι βοᾶν* *I.T.* 1092), does not this likeness also suggest that Pindar was running in Aeschylus's mind? Indeed, I believe that v. 39 in its original form had far greater likeness to the Pindaric phrase than it has in the traditional form. There is difficulty in construing vv. 38 and 39, as they stand. *λήθομαι*, of course with *ἐκὼν*, means 'forget on purpose' and need give us no trouble; but where is its object, and what are we to do with *αὐδῶ* and the following *καὶ* where we do not want a finite form at all, but a participle or equivalent? The Pindaric phrase helps us out in part, and I would write *ὦν ἐκὼν ἐγώ, μαθοῦσιν αὐδῆς, οὗ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι*. There is a somewhat similar corruption to that assumed in *αὐδῶ κοῦ* in v. 1244, where for *κλύοντ' ἀληθῶς, οὐδὲν ἐξηκασμένα* we

should read *κλύοντ' ἀληθῇ κοῦδὲν ἐξηκασμένα*.¹

Of the remainder of the prologue I have less to say. I would accept Hermann's transposition of *Ἰοῦ ἰού*, would take *συμφορᾶς* in v. 20 as 'coincidence' (*τῇσδε συμφορᾶς χάριν* must then go with *χαίρε*), would read *σημανῶ* in v. 26, would take *δόμοις* in v. 27 as locative and construe *τῇδε λαμπάδι* in v. 28 with *ἐπορθιάζειν*, and I would understand *θήσσομαι* in v. 32 as a poetic equivalent of *ποιήσομαι* in the sense of *ἡγήσομαι*. Furthermore, I would understand *δεσποτῶν* (v. 32) as referring to Agamemnon and Clytemnestra² and the words τὰ *δεσποτῶν εὐ πεσόντα* as = τὰ τῶν *δεσποτῶν εὐτυχῇ*. Lastly, the contrast with *δεσποτῶν* demands that we write in v. 33 not *τῇσδέ μοι* but *τῇσδ' ἐμοί*.

I have appended the continuous text of the prologue, as I would write it, and have added a close translation, which will be found to fill some small gaps in the commentary above.

[NOTE.—The prologue possibly occupied one page of a MS. that had 38 or 39 lines to the page, and vv. 36-39 were added by the scribe that first omitted them, when he discovered his blunder, at the foot of the page. For evidence of the existence of MSS. of the Tragedians with 39 lines to the page see Hayley on Eur. *Alc.* 312.]

Θεοὺς μὲν αἰτῶ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγὴν πόνων
φρουρᾶς ἐτείας μῆκος ἦν, κοιμώμενος
στέγαις Ἀτρεΐδων ἀγαθὸν κυνὸς δίκην,
ἄστρων κάτοιδά νυκτέρων ὁμήγυριν
καὶ τοὺς φέροντας χεῖμα καὶ θέρος βροτοῖς 5
λαμπροὺς δυνάστας ἐμπρέποντας αἰθέρι 6
καὶ νῦν φυλάσσω λαμπάδος τὸ σύμβολον, 8
αὐγὴν πυρὸς φέρονσαν ἐκ Τροίας φάτιν
ἀλώσιμόν τε βάζειν· ὧδε γὰρ κρατεῖ 10
γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζον κέαρ·
εὖτ' ἂν δέ, νυκτίπλαγκτον ἐνδρόσόν τ' ἐχω<ν>
εὐνήν—ὄνειροις οὐκ ἐπισκοπομένην
ἐμὴν· φόβος γὰρ ἀντίος παρασταεῖ
τὸ μὴ βεβαίως βλέφαρα συμβαλεῖν ὕπνῳ— 15
ὅταν δ', αἰδεῖν ἢ μινύρεσθαι δοκῶ
ὑπνον τὸδ' ἀντίμολπον ἐντέμνων ἄκος,
κλαῖω τότ' οἶκον τοῦδε συμφορὰν στένων
οὐχ, ὥς τὰ πρόσθ', ἄριστα δεσποτινόμενον— 19
τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ· βούς ἐπὶ γλώσσει μέγας 36

¹ This correction has been anticipated by Professor van Herwerden (*Exercitationes Criticae*, p. 99).

² Of course, the reference is specially to Agamemnon, and Clytemnestra can only be included by a specious optimism on the speaker's part, as though the evils he bewails in the present and dreads in the future were not there. His real thought appears in the 3^d *σὺν* of v. 34.

βέβηκεν' οἶκος δ' αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι, 37
 σαφέστατ' ἂν λέξειεν ὧν ἐκὼν ἐγώ, 38
 μαθοῦσιν αὐδῆς, οὐ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι. 39
 Νῦν δ' εὐτυχὴς γένοιτ' ἀπαλλαγὴ πόνων 20
 εὐαγγέλου φανέντος ὀρφναίου πυρός. 21
 Ἴου, Ἴου· 22
 ὦ χαῖρε, λαμπτήρ νυκτὸς ἡμερήσιον 22
 φάος πιφανύσκων καὶ χορῶν κατάστασιν 24
 πολλῶν ἐν Ἄργει, τῆσδε συμφορᾶς χάριν. 26
 Ἀγαμέμνωνος γυναικὶ σῆμανώ τωρῶς
 εὐνῆς ἐπαντείλασαν ὡς τάχος δόμοις
 ὀλολυγμὸν εὐφημοῦντα τῇδε λαμπάδι
 ἐπορθιάζειν, εἴπερ Ἰλίου πόλις
 ἐάλωκεν, ὡς ὁ φρυκτὸς ἀγγέλλον πρέπει· 30
 αὐτὸς τ' ἐγὼγε φροῖμιον χορεύσομαι
 τὰ δεσποτῶν γὰρ εὖ πεσόντα θήσομαι
 τρὶς ἐξ βαλοῦσῃς τῆσδ' ἐμοὶ φρυκτωρίας.
 Γίνουτο δ' οὖν μολάντος εὐφιλῆ χέρα
 ἄνακτος οἶκον τῇδε βαστάσαι χερί. 35

2-3 Sensui interpunctionem accommodavi.

4 Virgulam post *δήγοριν* vulgo positam omisi, qui *δυνάστας* quoque cum *ἄστρον* iungendum esse censeam.

6 Virgulam sive gravius punctum post *αἰθέρι* omisi, quia simplex sententia est ἢν φυλάσσω.

12 Post *δέ* virgulam inserui; *ἔχων* scripsi sicut olim Weil.

13 et 15 Verba quaedam a poeta διὰ μέσου iniecta lineis indicavi.

14 *ἀντίος* scripsi viam monstrante Weckleino, qui *ἀντίπνοος* imprimendum curavit. Idem iam proposuerat van Herwerden.

19 *δεσποτουμένου* pro *διαπονουμένου* praeuenitibus aliis cum *Duebnero* restitui.

Versus 36-39 huc reduxi. Idem iam fecerat van Herwerden.

39 Ratione habita et loci sententiae et uncialis litterarum ductus et Pindarici illius *φωάντα* (quod sic scribendum esse censeo) *συκετοῖσιν* restituere conatus sum Aeschyleam manum. Cf. *Ag.* 1244, ubi pro, *ἀλῆθ' ΩC* οὐδὲν scribendum erat *ἀλῆθ' ΗΚ* οὐδὲν.

25 In sedem suam reposui cum Hermanno.

26 Deteriorum librorum *σημανῶ* Medicei illi *σημαίνω* cum Weckleino praetulī.

33 *τῆσδ'* ἐμοὶ pro librorum *τῆσδέ μοι* reposui.

The gods, it is true, I am asking for release from those toils of a watch a year in length which, couching on the roofs of the Atreidae upon elbow dogwise, I have learned full well the night stars' rank and file<in>

and those bright lords <of theirs>, looming in the aether, that bring winter and summer to mortals and now am keeping for that token of a torch, a gleam of fire that shall bring out of Troy speech and talk of capture; for thereto constrains <me> a woman's man-minded expectant heart: whensoever, though, occupying a night-buffed and dewy couch— <a couch> by dreams unvisited in my case; for fear is at <my> side preventing my closing my eyelids tight in sleep—, whenever, I say, <occupying such a couch>, I am thought to be singing or humming, using that as a charm against sleep, I am <really> at such times weeping, mourning this house's misfortune, which is not, as once, most fitly governed—but I say no more; an ox upon my tongue stands heavy; but the house for itself, could it receive <the gift of> speech, would tell most clearly what I, of my own will, though voiceful to them that know, to them that know not forget. Now, however, may a fortunate release from toils come by the appearing of the fire of good news through the murk of night. Hurrah! hurrah! ah! welcome, thou beamer that by night daylight dost shew and <dost betoken> the holding of dances many in Argos, <welcome> for that thou comest upon the heels of my word! To Agamemnon's wife I'll signal clear that rising starlike¹ from her couch with all speed she shrill a cry of worshipful welcome over this torch, if indeed Troy-town is taken, as the beacon looms its message; and for myself I'll dance a prelude <to the public dances>; for my master's game I'll count a winning one now that this beacon-watch has thrown me treble six. But, <whether a winning game or not>, may it be <mine>, when he comes home again, to lift the well-beloved hand of the lord of the house with this hand of mine.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

¹ 'Der Wächter ist noch ganz eingenommen von der Beobachtung der Sterne,' (Wecklein.)

NOTE ON AGAMEMNON 326.

νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δρᾶμών.

Without pretending to find a final solution of this old *crux* I think there is an element of evidence which has been

neglected. All the commentators analyse word for word in the attempt to discover a meaning; but in analysing word for word we may break up some organic unit of phrase and so be further than ever from

the truth. Such an organic unit of phrase there is in the words *πρῶτος—καί—τελευταίος*.

(1) Herod. ix. 28: *τελευταῖοι δὲ καὶ πρῶτοι Ἀθηναῖοι ἐτάσσοντο* in the order of battle at Plataea.

(2) Xenophon *Memor.* I i. 8: *καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τοὺς ἀρίστους δεῖ πρῶτους τάττειν καὶ τελευταίους*.....(cf. also 9.)

(3) Charito *Chaereas and Callirrhoe* I. 5 (p. 419 in Didot's *Erotici*): *Χαιρέας δ' ἔτι τῷ θυμῷ ζῶν δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς ἀποκλείσας ἐαυτὸν ἐβασάνιζε τὰς θεραπανίδας, πρῶτην δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν τὴν ἄβραν*.

In (1) it means *on the extreme wing*; in

(2) *on the extreme of both wings* (cf. Suidas *τελευταῖος—ἔσχατος*); in (3) apparently, by a metaphor, *as a prime and final test*.

From which I conclude that any satisfactory explanation must treat *πρῶτος—καί—τελευταῖος* as a collocation not to be disturbed; that the phrase characterises the nearest-to-Argos of the chain of *λαμπαδηφόροι*; and (doubtfully) that Clytemnestra's meaning is 'such is my prompt ordinance of torchbearers; and the winner in the race is my first hand watchman, the fugleman of the array on whom all depends.'

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF PLATO, *REPUBLIC*, B. vi. p. 503 C.

Εὐμαθεὺς καὶ μνήμονες καὶ ἀγχίνοι καὶ ὀξεῖς καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοῖς τοῖς ἐπεταί οἷσι' ὅτι οὐκ ἐθέλονσιν ἅμα φύεσθαι καὶ νεανικοὶ τε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς τὰς διανοίας οἷοι κοσμίως μετὰ ἡσυχίας καὶ βεβαιότητος ἐθέλειν ζῆν, ἀλλ' οἱ τοιοῦτοι ὑπὸ ὀξύτητος φέρονται ὅπη ἂν τύχωσι, καὶ τὸ βέλαιον ἅπαν αὐτῶν ἐξοίχεται.

I have given the following rendering ('Plato's Republic' in Murray's Home and School Series, p. 118):—

'Quick intelligence, memory, sagacity, cleverness and similar qualities are seldom found in the same nature with that force of character, and grandeur of conception, which are conducive to orderliness and quietness and a well-sustained career. Men of genius are carried hither and thither by their impulsiveness, and all steadiness is eliminated from their lives.'—See also J. and C.'s edition, Vol. iii. p. 298.

To this it is objected, (1) that the opposition between courage and gentleness 'is everywhere regarded by Plato as the fundamental antithesis of human character'; and (2) that *νεανικός* means 'full of youthful vigour,' 'spirited,' and nothing more.

'We may therefore be certain that *νεανικοὶ—μεγαλοπρεπεῖς* is opposed to *οἷοι—ζῆν*.' (See J. Adam's edition of the *Republic* of Plato, Vol. ii, p. 80).

I answer—

1. The passages in which courage and gentleness are opposed, although closely akin to that in question, are not precisely parallel to it. For Plato is not here repeating what he has said above about the union of fierceness with friendliness

(ii. 375 c), or of the spirited element with the philosophic nature (iii. 410 DE). He is speaking of the combination of different qualities in the philosophic nature itself:—of keenness with solidity,—of brilliance with depth. 'My son has plenty of *ability*,' said Mr. Gladstone the elder, 'but I fear that he is wanting in *stability*.' Both powers are needed if a man is to acquire the philosophic temper, or become an ideal ruler.

2. It will hardly be questioned that in characterizing the latter attribute of weight, solidity, stability, or depth, the word *μεγαλοπρεπής* is sufficiently in place. Plato's *μεγαλοπρεπής* has been compared to the *μεγαλόψυχος* of Aristotle, and it may be worth while to adduce some of the familiar words (*Eth. N.* iv. 7, 1123b) *οὐδαμῶς δ' ἂν ἀρμόζοι μεγαλόψυχῳ φείγειν παρασεύσαντι, οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν· τίνος γὰρ ἔνεκα πράξει αἰσχροῦ, ὃ οὐθὲν μέγα; . . . καὶ κίνησις δὲ βραδεία τοῦ μεγαλόψυχου δοκεῖ εἶναι, καὶ φωνὴ βαρεῖα, καὶ λέξις στάσιμος· οὐ γὰρ σπενστικὸς ὁ περὶ ὀλίγα σπουδάζων, οὐδὲ σύντονος ὁ μὴ ἐν μέγα οἴομενος· ἢ δ' ὀξύφωνα καὶ ἡ ταχύτης διὰ τούτων*.

And I maintain that *νεανικός* in Plato's use of it is no less appropriate. In this I am glad to be supported by the authority of Vermehren, whose interpretation agrees with mine. (In Mr. Adam's references 'Theat. 165' should be 'Theat. 168').

If *νεανικός* in Plato had meant 'spirited' and nothing more, would not the word have appeared in one of the ten passages (including *Charmides* 159, 160), where courage and gentleness are opposed? *It appears in none of them*. The notion of

Youth in Greek literature has the two principal associations of *activity* and *strength*; and these are not to be confounded. When the οἰκίτης in Aesch. *Cho.* 879 cries καὶ μάλ' ἡβώντος δὲ δέῃ, he is calling not for an agile stripling, but for a strong man in his prime. And effective strength rather than impetuous vehemence is the idea conveyed by νεανικός in Plato, who employs the word sometimes seriously sometimes ironically (as in *Rep.* viii. 563E), but always with a note of admiration.

‘Πρὸς τοῦτοις τὸν κολοφῶνα’—In Aristotle’s grand description of the lion as the most manful of quadrupeds the word νεανικός twice occurs with a meaning comparable to that which I have here attributed to it, and in a context which I may quote without irrelevancy (*Physiognomica*, 5, p. 809):—

Φαίνεται τῶν ζῶων ἀπάντων λέων τελειώτατα μετεληφέναι τῆς τοῦ ἄρρενος ιδέας . . . ἔχει . . . ὤμους ῥωμαλέους καὶ στῆθος νεανικόν . . . σκέλη ἑρρωμένα καὶ νευρώδη, βάσιν δὲ νεανικὴν . . . βαδίζον δὲ βραδέως, καὶ μεγάλα διαβαῖνον, καὶ διασπαλνόν ἐν τοῖς ὤμοις ὅταν πορεύηται . . . τὰ δὲ περὶ ψυχὴν δοτικὸν καὶ ἐλεύθερον, μεγαλόψυχον καὶ φιλόνοικον, καὶ πρᾶν καὶ δίκαιον καὶ φιλόστοργον πρὸς ἅ ἄν ὁμιλήσῃ.

The strong and gentle lion and the versatile leopard in this passage of Aristotle may not inaptly represent Plato’s contrast between the ἀγχίνος καὶ ὀξεύς and the νεανικός καὶ μεγαλοπρεπείς τὰς διανοίας.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

ALASSIO, ITALY,
December 9, 1902.

NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA AND THE TEXT OF THEOCRITUS.

I.

The scholiast on Theocritus 1. 72 (*k*), who tried to secure accuracy of statement by proposing the reading ἂν ἔκλαυσε, is an amusing, if not a fair representative of his class. But in spite of the obvious untrustworthiness of much of the material in the older scholia,¹ many students of the Daphnis-myth, in their efforts to interpret Theocritus’s version, or versions, of the story, seek in the ancient commentary on the poet support for theories advanced on other grounds, and allow themselves to accept suggestions here and there in the scholia without consideration of the whole body of the commentary so far as it relates to the motif in Theocritus. An examination of all the scholia bearing on this subject may show an interrelation among the different comments which has not been noticed, and may lead us to a proper estimate of their value.

The opening verses of the song in the first idyll, and especially the reference to the absence of the nymphs, are the occasion of three notes which clearly represent one and the same interpretation of Theocritus’s story of Daphnis. These notes read in the *scholia vetera* as follows:

1. 65. . . . Ἄλλως. ὡς Σικελιώτου αὐτοῦ ὄντος καὶ κατὰ τὴν Αἴτην νέμοντος. μέλλει δὲ ἄδειν ὃν τρόπον ὁ Δάφνης, μὴ δυνάμενος φέρειν τὸν τῆς Ξενίας τοῦνομα Νύμφης² ἔρωτα ἀπέλιπε τὸ ζῆν. (cf. *k*).

1. 66. . . . ὅτι γοῦν Νύμφης ἦρα ὁ Δάφνης, ἡ δὲ Νύμφη ἀπεστρέφετο αὐτὸν διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἑτέρας γυναῖκας ὁμιλίαν, αἰνίσσεται ὅτι οὐδὲ αἱ λοιπαὶ ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἦσαν ὅτε ὁ Δάφνης ἔθνησκεν.

1. 69. . . . ὁ δὲ νοῖς αἱ Νύμφαι τότε οὐκ ἦσαν περὶ Σικελίαν ὅτε ὁ Δάφνης ἐπασχέ τι, ἴσως διὰ τὸ Νύμφης ἐρᾶν ὑπερφηανουσίῃς αὐτὸν αἰνισσόμενος ὡς οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν αὐτόθι οὐσῶν. (cf. *k* and the *scholia recentiora*).

These three notes, although in their present form they may come from different sources, are clearly consistent in their explanation of the story. This explanation is, in brief, that Daphnis’s suffering is caused by unrequited love. Two other points are of importance: the scholium on 1. 65 identifies Xenea of the seventh idyll with the heroine of the first idyll; furthermore, the reference to ‘the nymph’ and to association with other women in the scholium on 1. 66, shows a familiarity with the orthodox version of the Daphnis-myth, which we may call for convenience ‘the Sicilian story.’³ In fact, to anybody who

¹ The older scholia have been roughly classified by Buck, *Dissert. Phil. Argentoratenscs*, xi. 337.

² Cf. *scholia vetera* on 7. 73: . . . Ἄλλως. μὴ τῶν Νυμφῶν ἡ Ξενία.

³ The reference to Aetna in the scholium on 1. 65

is familiar with the facts of this version of the story as it appears in Timaeus (*ap. Parthenius περὶ ἑρωτ. παθ.* 29), Diodorus (4. 84), Aelian (*Var. Hist.* 10. 18), Ps.-Servius and Philargyrius (on Vergil *Ecl.* 5. 20), the interpretation presented in these three notes is a patent attempt to reconcile the story in Theocritus with the Sicilian story so far as the content of Theocritus admits such an adaptation: a complete identification of the two is impossible so long as Xenea in the seventh idyll is assumed to be the heroine of the first; for in this case the two women, essential to the Sicilian tale, do not appear in Theocritus.

The existence of this prejudice in favour of the Sicilian story appears even more clearly in the long note on 8. 93 in the older scholia. This note falls naturally into three parts: I quote from *k*, but the same note appears in a slightly different form in Ahrens's *scholia vetera*:

(1) . . . ἰστοροῦσι γὰρ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τινος ἀγαπηθῆναι Νύμφης, ἣν Σωσίθεος Θάλειαν καλεῖ. παρακλεσαμένης δὲ αὐτῆς ἄλλη γυναῖκί μὴ ὁμιλεῖν, μὴ τηρήσας τὴν παραίνεσιν αὐτῆς ἐμνήθη αὐτῇ. ὅθεν ὁ μὲν Θεόκριτός φησι τὴν Νύμφην ἀποστῆναι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸν δὲ ἀντιμεταβαλόντα τὸν ἐκείνης ἑρωτα ὑπὸ λύπης μεταλλάξαι τὸν βίον.

(2) ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν μὲν φησιν ἀπείπασθαι αὐτήν, ἄλλης δ' ἐρασθῆναι 'ὡς ποκα τῆς Ξενίας ἡράσαστο Δάφνης' = 7. 73.

(3) οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ φασὶ τυφλωθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ ἀλώμενον κατακρημνισθῆναι.¹

It is worth noticing that this scholium is hardly in place here, where the verse itself simply records Daphnis's marriage with the nymph Nais—a statement which the scholium, for all its wealth of information, fails to explain. But, however inappropriate it may be, it illustrates clearly the way in which the minds of the ancient commentators worked upon the material in Theocritus.

The first part of the note, aside from the reference to Sosithus, is a fuller statement of the interpretation set forth on 1. 65–69, and shows an even better acquaintance with the details of the Sicilian story: not only the nymph and her rival, but the compact between the nymph and Daphnis appear

in this scholium very much as in the accounts of Timaeus and the others who recorded the folk tale. Only the conclusion is changed: Daphnis, instead of being at once blinded, is cast off by the nymph, again falls in love with her, only to perish in the bitterness of unrequited love. The material in the first idyll, or in the first and the seventh, which led to this change in the conclusion of the Sicilian folk-tale is evident enough; Daphnis in the first idyll is clearly in love, and as clearly not enjoying his love; to students of the idyll who could shut their eyes to vss. 97–98, or explain them to their own satisfaction as part of such a theory, Daphnis must be a victim of unrequited love. And vss. 72–77 of the seventh idyll do not oppose this theory: on the contrary, if ἀμφεπολεῖτο or a synonymous word was the reading in v. 74 in the MSS. of the scholiasts, this verse at least would go far to support the interpretation offered. That this interpretation is merely a patching together of the Sicilian tale and of the facts in Theocritus is suggested by the language of this part of the scholium: the facts derived from the folk-tale are introduced by the generalizing plural ἰστοροῦσι; the novel catastrophe, for which Theocritus's words are alone responsible, is ascribed only to Theocritus—ὅθεν ὁ μὲν Θεόκριτός φησι κ.τ.λ.

The second part of the scholium is parenthetical, for the μὲν just quoted from the first part of the scholium is answered by the δὲ in οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ of the third part. This parenthesis is an almost reckless indulgence of the bias in favour of the Sicilian tale exhibited in the first part of the scholium: here we have a complete identification of Theocritus's version with the folk-tale. And notice that this complete identification necessitates a contradiction of the scholium on 1. 65: for the quotation of 7. 73 in this place shows that the writer, to justify his ascription of the Sicilian tale to Theocritus, assumes that Xenea in the seventh idyll is not the nymph, but 'the other woman' of the Sicilian story.

The third part of the scholium, as the δὲ shows, refers properly to the catastrophe as described at the end of the first part—ὅθεν ὁ μὲν Θεόκριτός φησι κ.τ.λ. The meaning of the whole scholium is briefly this: Theocritus is using the motif of the Sicilian tale, but in a modified form (unless 7. 73 proves that he is using the Sicilian tale in its pure form): for the other narrators of the Sicilian tale make it end differently.

Finally, it seems to me that the whole

is, of course, taken from the text of Theocritus rather than from Timaeus. A summary of the ancient evidence for the Sicilian story may be found in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, x. 124, 125: the position taken in that article with regard to Theocritus's version of the story is untenable.

¹ The necessary variations from the MS. may be seen in Ziegler's *apparatus*.

scholium, in its essence if not in its present form, represents the view of a single scholar; the second part of the scholium is not an insertion, and a contradiction of the first part, for the μέν and δέ, joining so closely the first and the third parts, make it clear, to my mind, that the second part is a parenthetical qualification that shows a strong prejudice in favour of the pure folk-tale, a prejudice which the writer cannot wholly indulge because of the nature of Theocritus's material. Furthermore, the second part, with its quotation of 7. 73 is not really a contradiction of the scholium on 1. 65, but rather an alternative interpretation which the writer does not favour.

So far, then, we find in the scholia an attempt to reconcile Theocritus's plot with that of the Sicilian story, and an alternative interpretation, proceeding probably from the same source, which discloses a willingness to identify the two plots if the material would allow it.

A short note on 1. 97 in *k* (to the same effect in the *scholia vetera* of Ahrens), reads as follows: ἴσως γὰρ ὁ Δάφνις μεγαλορρημονήσας εἰς τὴν θεὸν ταύτην ὑπέσχετο τὴν ποιήν. The brevity of this comment makes it difficult to suggest its relation to the scholia already discussed. It seems at first to be an independent interpretation. The verse which it serves to explain would certainly trouble those who were determined to impose the Sicilian tale on Theocritus, for in that story Daphnis's resistance to the allurements of love was an unimportant feature and limited to the period between his compact with the nymph and his meeting with the Sicilian princess. It may be only a lame concession on the part of the scholar, (or his followers), who is responsible for the theory advanced on 8. 93.

The comments in the older scholia on 1. 81-85 have influenced almost every editor of Theocritus, and almost every recent student of the Daphnis-myth in Theocritus. In part, at least, they have been accepted by scholars as a correct interpretation of Theocritus. But I hope to show that the commentary on this passage is nothing but part and parcel of the theory advanced in the scholium on 8. 93; if this is the case, the comments on 1. 81-85 fall to the ground, along with the theory that Theocritus is using the motif of the Sicilian story, a theory which no recent students of Theocritus venture to uphold.

The verses of Theocritus upon which the comments are made represent Priapus as saying that 'the maiden' is seeking Daphnis:

NO. CXLVIII. VOL. XVII.

obviously, if the maiden is the nymph either of the modified Sicilian story or of the Sicilian story in its pure form, as the writer on 8. 93 recounts them, this statement must be a falsehood; if 'the maiden' is 'the other woman' of the Sicilian story in either of the two forms offered on 8. 93, the scholar responsible for the scholium on the eighth idyll, and his followers, will refer the words in the first idyll to 'the king's daughter' of the Sicilian story. Now it is just these explanations which we find in the scholia on 1. 85 (*k*), and to the same effect in the *scholia vetera*.

...εἰρωνεύμενος δὲ λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν· αὐτὸς γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐζητεῖ...τινὲς δὲ φασιν ὡς οὐ διὰ τὴν Νύμφην, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως θυγατέρα, δέ' ἦν καὶ ἐπηρώθη.—'Ἄλλως...εἰρωνεύεται δέ'· ζητεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸς μᾶλλον, οὐ ζητεῖται ἐπὶ τῆς Νύμφης. ἥ καὶ παρηγορητικὸς ὁ λόγος.

It is clear that the supporters either of the partial reconciliation of Theocritus's story with the Sicilian tale or of the complete identification of the two would find a stumbling block in these verses: and the suggestion that Priapus is falsifying, either maliciously, or benevolently (ἡ καὶ παρηγορητικὸς ὁ λόγος), and also the suggestion, ascribed to 'some,' that the woman is the king's daughter can come only, in the final analysis, from advocates of the theory advanced on 8. 93. We cannot say that the commentary on 1. 85 in its present form, or that the essence of all of it, came from the single scholar who, I believe, was responsible for the essential facts in the scholium on 8. 93. But he must have offered some explanation of the absolute contradiction between his theory and these verses of the first idyll. And I believe that unless modern scholars are willing to advocate the theory offered by the scholiast on 8. 93, they should not reckon with the commentary on 1. 85; and if they wish to set up on other grounds a theory that Theocritus's Daphnis is a victim of unrequited love, they should not quote the scholia on 1. 85 in defence of their theory, although they may choose, independently of the scholia, to assert that Priapus is falsifying.¹

¹ Although it is no part of my present purpose to consider the true meaning of Theocritus's first and seventh idylls, I may suggest my own view of the difficult problem. The interpretation offered by Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 213, seems to me correct, except in so far as it is marred by the author's belief in the mysticism of the first idyll: to omit the parts with which I do not agree—'Daphnis hat sich gerühmt, der Aphrodite fern zu bleiben, . . . Darum zürnt die Göttin und sendet

The source of this theory, which if my conclusions are correct, is the basis of all the older scholia bearing on the story of Daphnis in Theocritus with the possible exception of the comment on l. 97, cannot be ascertained. But there is opportunity for a plausible conjecture. The theory in question is that Theocritus followed in some degree the Sicilian folk-tale. The interpretation to which this theory gives rise ascribes to the poet the following plot: Daphnis broke his compact with the nymph, and associated with another woman; whereupon the nymph's love turned to hatred, and Daphnis, in attempting to gratify a renewal of his love for her, met only with rebuffs; he died of sorrow. Now a single verse of Ovid has played an ever-changing part in studies of the Daphnis-myth; some who have constructed theories into which it fitted, have quoted it with satisfaction in proof of their assertions¹; others who have found it irreconcilable with other versions of the story have dismissed it as an inaccurate reminiscence of Theocritus 8. 93.² The verse, *Ars Amat.* 1. 732, runs as follows:

Pallidus in lenta Naide Daphnis erat.

Certainly this is a concise statement of the interpretation which appears in the scholium on Theocritus 8. 93, and by implication in the comments on l. 65-69 and l. 85. In this verse and in the scholia a stubborn nymph is the cause of the neatherd's suffering. Now the name Nais in Ovid is apparently derived from Theocritus 8. 93. Is it not possible that our scholium on 8. 93 appeared, essentially as we have it now, in Ovid's edition of Theocritus, and if so, was not this the edition by Theon,³ which was published probably in the last years of the reign of Augustus? From such a note in

ihm verzehrende Liebe, . . . Bis zum Tode leistet er dem Trieb der Göttin Widerstand, noch im Hades wird er der Feind des Eros, . . . I see no reason why so many students of the subject from Van Lennep (quoted in Meineke³ on l. 85) down to Helm (*Philologus*, lviii. 111 ff.) insist that the love of Daphnis was not requited, and so accept the commentary, in part, of the scholiasts on l. 85, or else amend *ζῆλον*, as Helm does. Why need we, with Hiller on l. 82, assume that Theocritus did not mean to ascribe to Priapus a more intimate knowledge of Daphnis's love affairs? Hermes was ignorant, for he had no interest in such matters; Priapus was just the person to know all the details. Roeder's article, 'Die Sage vom Daphnis,' in the *Using-Festschrift*, is not accessible to me.

¹ As Helm, *Philologus*, lviii. 119.

² Hiller, note on 8. 93.

³ Concerning Theon and his edition, see Ahrens, *Bucol. Gr. Reliq.* II, xxvii.-xxxi., *Philologus*, xxxiii. 392, and Bethe, *De Theocriti editionibus*, 9 ff.

Theon's edition, Ovid may well have derived his information. It is, of course, equally possible that Ovid may have arrived at the same interpretation of the first idyll independently of any notes, but I venture to offer this suggestion as a conjecture, fully aware that the range of possibilities in the explanation of the resemblance between Ovid's verse and the scholiast's theory is not exhausted.

It is also possible that the verses of Nonnus, *Dionys.* 15. 307, are an echo of this interpretation of Theocritus:

ἃ πόσα Δάφνης αἶδεν ὁ βουκόλος ἀμφὶ δὲ
μολπῇ
παρθένος ἀστιβέουσιν ἐκείθετο μᾶλλον ἐρίπνας
ποιμενίης φεύγουσα βοῆς μέλος.

Nonnus may have agreed with the comments on l. 85 that Priapus was not telling the truth, and may have given what he thought was Theocritus's real version of the incident with a reminiscence of Theocritus 1. 82-83, as has been noted by others, and of 7. 73-74 (especially if the reading *ἀμφοτερότερον*, of which traces appear in the *scholia recentiora*, was before him). In this case *παρθένος* is ἡ κόρη of the first idyll, or Xenea of the seventh, and the nymph of the story which appears in the older scholia on 8. 93, and by implication on l. 65-69, 1. 85.

It appears, then, that the older scholia bearing on Theocritus's plot of the story of Daphnis represent a consistent effort to reconcile Theocritus's story with the Sicilian folk-tale: this effort results in the invention of a plot which is fully stated in the scholium on 8. 93, and which is the real basis of the commentary on l. 85. The same plot is briefly referred to in Ovid's verse in the *Ars Amatoria*; the occurrence in Ovid of the name Nais, which also appears in Theocritus 8. 93, and the fact that the scholium on 8. 93 recounts the plot referred to in Ovid's verse, lead me to suggest that the interpretation of Theocritus found in the scholia goes back as far as the edition of Theon.

II.

Rohde in *Der griechische Roman*² (marginal page 78, n. 1), suggested that the argument (in *k*) of Theocritus's ninth idyll contained an intentional correction of the scholium on 8. 55 (*k*), and that this correction itself involved an error.

The scholium on 8. 55 reads as follows: Αὐτάρκης τις ὁ Δάφνης, [ὅθεν καὶ λέγει] ᾗδασθαι ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις ἔχων τὸν ἐρώμενον ὑπὸ τῇ πέτρᾳ

ἀφορῶν τὴν Σικελικὴν αἶα καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν [ποίησιν]. οὐκ ἀνιστορήτως δὲ τοῦτο ὁ Θεόκριτος φησὶ καὶ Ἑρμεσιάναν λέγει τὸν Δάφνιν ἐρωτικῶς ἔχειν τοῦ Μενάλκα. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐπ' Εὐβοίας. τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ διατίθεται, οὗτος δὲ ἐπὶ Σικελίας.

The argument of 9 reads: ...οὐδὲν δὲ ἔχει πρὸς τὸν Μενάλκαν τοῦτον ὄντα Σικελὸν [τὰ] ὑπὲρ Μενάλκου Χαλκιδῆως, ὃν φησιν Ἑρμεσιάναν ἐρασθῆναι τῆς Κυρηναίας Εὐίπης καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ τυγχάνειν αὐτῆς κατακρημνισθῆναι.¹

On the strength of this imperfect correction Rohde asserted that Hermesianax told nothing of a love affair between Menalcas, the Euboean hero and unsuccessful wooer of Euippe, and Daphnis,² and that the Euboean Menalcas had nothing in common with the Menalcas of Theocritus, and quite as little perhaps with the older mythical hero Menalcas who played a part in the popular tale of Eriphanis (Clearchus *ap.* Athenaeus 619 c).

Reitzenstein (*Epigramm und Skolion*, 257, n. 2) denied that the argument of the ninth was a polemic against the scholium on 8. 55, and noted that Rohde's view rested on the incorrect assumption that Theocritus in his eighth idyll represented Daphnis and Menalcas in love with each other. He further maintained (p. 257) that Hermesianax did bring Daphnis and Menalcas together in one and the same poem.

Neither of these two scholars, however, has stated the whole truth of the matter and discovered, or at least mentioned, what is perfectly obvious, that the scholium on 8. 55 rests on a misunderstanding of Theocritus: and Rohde's misconception, which Reitzenstein corrects, is really the scholiast's misconception, which Rohde unhappily followed. Vss. 53-56 were undoubtedly regarded by the scholiast as the utterance of Daphnis³: in this case the *τῷ* of verse 55 clearly should refer to ἡ καλὰ παῖς, (or καλὰ Ναῖς, according to Meineke), of v. 47, but the scholiast has been carelessly misled into referring *τῷ* to Menalcas, and upon this misinterpretation the scholium is based. There is, then, all the more need of correction, and I am inclined to agree with

¹ The different spellings of the proper name Hermesianax, which I take from Ziegler, and of the genitive of Μενάλκας, in these two comments, are worth noticing. The mistake in the former might be significant if we could be sure that the editor was not at fault.

² Rohde points out that there is no trace of a pederastic motif elsewhere in Hermesianax.

³ See the apparatus of Ahrens and of Ziegler. Recent editors, with the exception of Cholmeley, assume a lacuna after 52, and give 53-56 to Menalcas: in this case *τῷ*, of course, refers to Milo.

Rohde that the argument of 9 is intended to serve this purpose. Rohde is wrong in so far as he thinks the correction itself involves an error, for it now becomes perfectly true that the Euboean Menalcas has nothing in common with the Menalcas of Theocritus, not even a love-affair with Daphnis, which Rohde, following the scholiast, falsely assumed for Theocritus, and hence concluded that the argument of 9 was itself partially incorrect. But as Rohde suggests, the author of the argument really intends to question the existence of a story by Hermesianax in which these two heroic figures were represented as in love one with the other. Certainly the untrustworthiness of the scholiast on 8. 55 is evident: and if his notion that in Theocritus the two were represented as in love with each other falls to the ground, we are more than ever suspicious of his contention that Hermesianax joined the two heroes in any way. The scholium is certainly a very weak basis for Reitzenstein's contention that Hermesianax did employ such a motif.

III.

‘οὐ φθεγγέῃ; λύκον εἶδες’; ἔπαυξέ τις. ‘ὥς σοφός’ εἶπε, κῆφάπτ’· εὐμαρῶς κεν ἀπ’ αὐτᾶς καὶ λύχρον ἄψας.—*Id.* xiv. 22-23.

The MSS, and early editions, according to Ziegler, offer at the beginning of v. 23 the readings κῆφατ’ ἐτ’ (*k*) κῆφατ’ ἐτ’ (*Junt. Call.*) κῆφατ’ εὐ (*p*) κῆφατ’ (*e*) κῆφα (*Med.*) κῆρα (*Ald.*). Hermann, without quoting any examples to support his conjecture, suggested the reading κῆφάπτ’, which was accepted by Ahrens and has not been molested, so far as I know, by subsequent editors of Theocritus. And yet the verb ἐφάπτεσθαι does not appear in the sense ‘to kindle’ (intransitive), ‘to flare up,’—meanings which are prerequisite to the sense required here,—in the lexica or in authors whose diction is registered in any of the *indices verborum* accessible to me; nor does the active ἐφάπτειν appear in the sense ‘to kindle.’⁴ Certainly we are not justified in assuming that any compound of ἄπτειν may mean ‘to kindle,’ and it seems to me that an occurrence of this particular compound in this particular sense must be found and quoted before we

⁴ The older editions of Euripides read ἐφάπτεται with the MSS. in *Bacchae* 778, but the verb is now corrected to ὑφάπτεται, the reading in the *Christus Patiens*.

may be satisfied with this reading which has gone unmolested for half a century.

The reading $\chi\acute{\upsilon}\phi\hat{\alpha}\pi\tau'$ is an easy suggestion, but the corruption of υ to η is difficult to explain unless the MS. in which the corrup-

tion occurred was copied from dictation at a time when the two vowels had the same sound-value.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

MESSALLA IN AQUITANIA.

Aquitania, it is well known, is a name with more than a single denotation in Roman history. It originally stood for Aquitania Proper, the country of the Aquitani, which according to the well known statement of Caesar *B. G.* i. 1 was that portion of Gallia Ulterior or Comata which was bounded by the Garonne, the Pyrenees, and the Atlantic Ocean. But subsequently it was applied to 'administrative Aquitania' the south western of the three sections into which Gallia Comata was divided by Augustus on his definitive organisation of the province. For reasons of politics and administration Aquitania Proper was enlarged by the inclusion of fourteen tribes of a different race who lived between the Garonne and the Loire; and the new province thus comprehended the whole tract of Gaul bounded on the west by the Ocean, on the south by the Pyrenees, on the north by the Loire and on the east by the Cevenna range (τὸ Κέμμενον ὄρος) and the Rhine; see Strabo, IV. i. 1 (pp. 146, 147 Diderot), ii. 1 (p. 157 D.), the last of which passages may be quoted here.

ἐξῆς δὲ περὶ τῶν Ἀκουιτανῶν λεκτέον καὶ τῶν προσωρισμένων αὐτοῖς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα Γαλατικῶν τῶν μεταξὺ τοῦ Γαρούνα κατοικούντων καὶ τοῦ Δείγηνος ὧν ἓνα ἐπιλαμβάνει καὶ τῆς τοῦ Ῥοδανοῦ ποταμίας καὶ τῶν πεδίων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ναρβωνίην· ἀπλῶς γὰρ εἰπεῖν οἱ Ἀκουιτανοὶ διαφέρουσι τοῦ Γαλατικοῦ κατὰ τε τὰς τῶν σωμάτων κατασκευὰς καὶ κατὰ τὴν γλῶτταν, εἰκάσι δὲ μᾶλλον Ἰβηρίσιν. ὁρίζονται δὲ τῷ Γαρούνῃ ποταμῷ ἐντὸς τοῦτου καὶ τῆς Πυρήνης οἰκοῦντες.

The exact date of this change there is no direct evidence to determine. Desjardins, *La Gaule Romaine* iii. p. 155, and Marquardt *Staatsverw.* i. 113 citing Dion Cassius 53 c. 12, who mentions the peoples of the four divisions of geographical Gaul (Γαλάται πάντες οἱ τε Ναρβωνήσιοι καὶ οἱ Λουγδονήσιοι Ἀκουιτανοὶ τε καὶ Βελγικοί, al. Κελτικοί), in connexion with the events of this year, agree in assigning it to the year 27 B.C. when Augustus spent a considerable time in Gaul.

This view has been rejected with great confidence by Professor Th. Mommsen (*Hermes* 15, 111)¹ on the grounds that the references in Dion are not decisive for the earlier date and that a reference in Suetonius Tiberius c. 9 is decisive against it.

I give the latter passage with the dates for the events mentioned in them, 'regnum Armeniae Tigrani [Tiberius] restituit, recepit et signa quae M. Crasso ademerant Parthi (20 B.C.). *Post hoc Comatum Galliam anno fere rexit*, et barbarorum incursionibus et principum discordia inquietam. exin Raeticum Vindelicumque bellum (15 B.C.), inde Pannonicum (12-10 B.C.), inde Germanicum (8, 7 B.C.) gessit.'

That Tiberius' governorship of Gallia Comata was subsequent to the year 27, is of course indisputable. But how the arguments advanced by the one historian, in the passage transcribed below, and repeated by the other can be regarded as in the least degree conclusive it is beyond my power to imagine. Agrippa died in B.C. 12 and it is not contested that Tiberius governed (*rexit*) Gallia Comata, the Gaul of the Three Provinces, before his death. In what capacity or, if you like, under what title he governed it, it is idle here to inquire. Neither Agrippa nor Augustus was a pedant; and the former who had been since B.C. 18 associated in the tribunician power and is described by Gardthausen as 'co-regent'² was not likely to have been influenced by the considerations of punctilious officialism which Mommsen thinks of importance, nor would the latter have felt precluded from disturbing an arrangement which had subsisted only a comparatively short time, did the state of the provinces suggest and the abilities of their governor justify their temporary re-union.³ In the default of

¹ Followed by Gardthausen in *Augustus und seine Zeit*, i. 665, ii. 359, where Mommsen's arguments, and indeed his language, are reproduced.

² 'Agrippa als Mitregent,' *Augustus, etc.*, i. 738, ii. 411 sq.

³ I transcribe Mommsen's observations in full that the reader may himself judge of their pertinence.

any definite statement to the contrary, we may well hold that etiquette would make way so far to the will of the princeps and the claims of the distinguished general and administrator who just before had received the captured standards from the Parthians and was presently to be entrusted with the conduct of the Rhaetian and Vindelician war. In the words of Dion Cassius which Mommsen cites there is nothing to discountenance the idea that he referred the division of Gallia Comata into three to the year B.C. 27. His words are in full: *καὶ τοῦτο μὲν καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλων ἐθνῶν μετὰ ταῦτ' ἐπράχθη ὡς πον καὶ ἡ διέξοδος τοῦ λόγου δηλώσει· ταῦτα δὲ οὕτω κατέλεξα ὅτι νῦν χωρὶς ἑκαστον αὐτῶν ἡγεμονεύεται ἐπεὶ τό γε ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἐπὶ πολλοῖ καὶ σύνδυο καὶ σύντριά τὰ ἔθνη ἅμα ἤρχετο, τῶν δὲ δὴ λοιπῶν οὐκ ἐμνημόνευσα ὅτι τὰ μὲν ὑστερον αὐτῶν προσεκρίθη τὰ δὲ εἰ καὶ τότε ἦδη ἐκεχειρώτο ἄλλ' οὐτὶ γε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἤρχετο ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.* It is clear that Dion is simply contrasting the more numerous provincial divisions of his own days with the few and larger ones of earlier epochs. The passage does not indeed prove the triple division to belong to B.C. 27, but neither does it militate against this date which on general considerations was selected by Desjardins and Marquardt as the most probable.

The scantiness of the material for reconstructing the history of the times of The words in square brackets are footnotes in the original.

Die Theilung der *Comata* in die drei späteren Provinzen wird allerdings auf Augustus zurückgeführt; aber das Jahr ist nicht überliefert. [Marquardt sagt freilich (Staatsverw. I. 113) dass Dio sie in das J. 727=27 v. Chr. setze; aber Dio fügt ja 53. 12 ausdrücklich hinzu: *ταῦτα*, etc.—*ἤρχετο*.] Dass Augustus diese wichtige Massregel nicht von Rom aus verfügt hat, hat alle Wahrscheinlichkeit für sich. Ob es geschehen ist während seines Aufenthalts in Gallien im J. 727 oder während seines langen Verweilens daselbst in den J. 738–741 würde dahingestellt bleiben müssen, wenn nicht eben unsere Stelle für die letztere Annahme entschiede. Dass Tiberius damals, bei Agrippas Lebzeiten, eigenes proconsularisches Imperium gehabt und das Regiment von Gallien in dieser Eigenschaft als Nachfolger Agrippas übernommen haben soll, ist ebenso ohne Anhalt in der Ueberlieferung wie staatsrechtlich und politisch unmöglich; es ist beinahe überflüssig daran zu erinnern, dass er nach Augustus eigener Angabe [Monumentum Ancyr. 5. 45 per Ti. Neronem qui tum erat priuignus et legatus meus. Vgl. Sueton. Tib. 12] noch den pannonischen Krieg als *legatus* seines Stiefvaters geführt, also sicher auch *Gallia Comata* lediglich als *legatus* verwaltet hat. Da nun nach Sueton diese Verwaltung nicht vor das J. 734 gesetzt werden kann, so ist das von Caesar eroberte Gallien nicht bereits im J. 727 getheilt worden. Wohl aber ist es wahrscheinlich dass dies in den J. 738–741 geschah, und Tiberius mag leicht der letzte dieser hochgestellten Statthalter gewesen sein.

Augustus is perhaps sufficiently clear from the foregoing; but we have not far to go for further proof of it. In our well nigh total ignorance of the operations in Gaul for which M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus triumphed in B.C. 27 we have to rely almost entirely upon allusions in the vague and perhaps partial language of a poet and a friend.

Tibullus in his commemoration of the birthday of the general writes I. vii. 1–14

Hunc cecinere diem Parcae fatalia nentes
stamina, non ulli dissoluenda deo;
hunc fore, Aquitanas posset qui fundere
gentes,

quem tremere fortis milite uictus Atax.
eueneret: nouos pubes Romana triumphos
uidit et euinctos brachia capta duces:
at te victrices lauros, Messalla, gerentem
portabat nitidis currus eburnus equis.
non sine me est tibi partus honos: Tarbella
Pyrene

testis et Oceani litora Santonici. 10
testis Arar Rhodanusque celer magnusque
Garonna,

Carnutis et flauis caerula lympha Liger.
an te, Cydne, canam, tacitis qui leniter
undis

caeruleus placidis per uada serpis aquis?

4 *Atur* Scaliger. 8 *nitidis* F. Wilhelm with the MSS., *nuicis* vulg. 9 *sine marie ibi*, Baehrens. 11 *Atur Rhodanusque* Scaliger. 12 *garrula* Gruppe. 14 *placidus*—*aquae* legendum ut uidetur.

In this passage, as it stands in the MSS, there are two geographical difficulties, both detected by Scaliger, to whom also we owe the all but certain correction *Tarbella* for *tu bella* in 9.¹ The motive of his two proposals for emendation was the same. He believed that an intimate friend of Messalla in an avowed commemoration of his military achievements would be careful, if mentioning rivers at all, to mention the rivers of the country which was the scene and the source of his triumphs. Now the *Atax*, the modern Aude, was the principal river of the Province; upon it stood the famous and flourishing Roman colony of Narbo, and it had been in Roman hands for nearly a hundred years. To triumph over the *Atax* was only a degree less difficult than to triumph over the *Anio*. To triumph over the *Arar* and the *Rhodanus* was of course possible. But Messalla more than deserved all his celebrity if he managed to bring home an 'Aquitanian triumph' from the banks of the Rhone and the Saône.

¹ Not absolutely certain as *testis* might have got into v. 10 from v. 11, driving out some such verb as *uidit*.

We may approve of Scaliger's scruples, without accepting his remedies, against which more than one consideration may be urged. It is possible, though not very probable, that *Atur* should have been twice corrupted within seven lines and into the names of two different streams. This form of the ancient name for the *Adour* rests only on the authority of Vibius Sequester, while that of the *Duranus* (Dordogne) is not otherwise attested and the vocative *Durani* would have fitted the metre. *Celer* indeed is a suitable epithet for the Dordogne; but it is no less a suitable one for the Rhone, particularly when coupled with the Saône.

The difficulties which led Scaliger to propose and O. Hirschfeld (*Sitzungsberichte Berl. Ak.* 1896, No. 22. 433 sq.) to accept the double alteration *Atur Duranusque* may perhaps be removed in another way. Let us see if the four rivers the Saône, the Rhone, the Loire, and the Garonne, mentioned in the couplet 11 sq. have anything in common. Their common property is that they form with the ocean what we may call the water-boundaries of the territory which, as we have seen, Augustus added to Aquitania. If then Messalla was entrusted with the duty of organising the province which was named after and built upon the region that had been the scene of his conquests, everything is in order. The poet first does honour to the achievements of his friend and then turns to the more congenial task of celebrating his peaceful ones first in Gaul and then in Asia and Italy 55 sqq. The reference to the Rhone (with which the Saône is, as so often, connected) is intelligible from the passage of Strabo already quoted. The function of the Loire is made clear by the mention of the Carnutes, the important tribe in the interior of Gaul whose territory adjoined it on the north and whose port, the considerable town of Genabum (Orleans), was situated on its banks.

Let us now return to verse 4

quem tremere fortis milite uictus Atax.

It is incredible that Tibullus who, whether he attended Messalla on this expedition or not, was at least his intimate friend and had every opportunity, private and public,¹ of acquainting himself with the fundamental facts of the campaign and the chief features of the country, should have written a line which suggests either that he thought the

river on which Narbo stood was a river of the Aquitani or else that he thought Messalla had subdued a river in the middle of the Roman Province.

With the disappearance of *Atur* and *Duranus* as candidates for consideration in 11, one of the objections to Scaliger's *Atur* in v. 4 disappears likewise, and with this restoration the line will give an acceptable sense. For the expression 'quem tremere', we might compare Propertius 2. 10. 16 'et domus intactae te tremit Arabiae.' As, however, I expect many readers will be loth, for palaeographical and other reasons, to make the exchange, I will indicate another route which emendation may take.

The alternative was suggested to me by an expression in another composition of a different quality, it is true, to the present poem, but written in honour of the same subject. The 'Panegyricus Messallae' by an unknown author was written after Messalla's consulship, B.C. 31, but before his expedition to Aquitania for which he triumphed in B.C. 27. It contains, of course, no reference to the incidents of the Aquitanian campaign or the organisation of the new province, but the writer speaks of the Pannonian War, in which Messalla took part (compare Gardthausen, Augustus, i. 330, ii. 164) in the following terms:—

at non per dubias errant mea carmina
laudes: 106
nam bellis experta cano. testis mihi uictae
fortis Iapydiae miles, testis quoque fallax
Pannonius, gelidas passim disiectus in
Alpes
testis Arupinis et pauper natus in aruis, 110
quem si quis uideat uetus ut non frerit
aetas,
terna minus Pyliae miretur saecula famae.²

It is no violation of probability to suppose that Tibullus had seen this eulogy of his friend or that some expressions in it had remained in his memory. Now if we suppose that the 'gallant troops' of Tibullus are not those of the conquering general but, as in the Panegyric, those of the conquered enemy (and it does indeed seem a higher compliment to a commander to extol the bravery of the resistance which has been overcome rather than that of the assistance which has enabled him to overcome it), then

¹ H. Belling's speculations (*Albius Tibullus, Untersuchungen*, p. 205) are rightly condemned by M. Schanz (*Geschichte d. Römischen Literatur*, ii. p. 165) as untenable.

² He might have seen the figures of the conquered streams carried in the triumphal procession: see Prop. 2. 1. 31 sq., Tacitus Annals 2. 41 al.

Atax may be kept, *quem* however must go. The necessary correction will be slight. For *quem* we have but to write *cum* and the sense is completely transformed. For the line will now allude, not to the incidents or results of Messalla's campaign, but to the circumstances which necessitated his dispatch to the scene of hostilities, and the consternation expressed by *tremere* will not be that of the beaten enemy but that of the provincials at the sudden irruption.

If then the previous reconstruction is correct in the main, the allusions in these lines of Tibullus enable us to sketch the course of events as follows:

The Aquitani who had already given trouble before broke into the Province, occupied the upper Aude and threatened Narbonne. At this alarming juncture Messalla was sent against the invaders. He defeated their forces and drove them back into their own country which he penetrated and traversed as far as the Western Pyrenees ('*Tarbella Pyrene*') and the mouth of the Gironde ('*Oceani litora Santonici*'). The Aquitani were thus completely reduced to submission: but the unrest and disorder which their inroad had produced made it desirable that the administration of Gaul should be reconstituted, and in the work of this reconstitution, one of whose features was the formation of the new Aquitania, Messalla took part.

Our history thus acquires a new clearness and consistency. The Aquitanian rising and campaign can be definitely ascribed to B.C. 28 and would be at an end by the spring of 27. Augustus we know visited Gaul and the Province in the summer (Livy, par. 134, Dion Cass. 53. 22): he had intended to go earlier, but domestic reasons and his health interfered (Gardthausen, i. 661 sq.), and Messalla could return to Rome to celebrate his triumph in the autumn.

We have hitherto argued on the hypothesis that Tibullus possessed merely such knowledge of the topography of Gaul and Aquitania as might be assumed for an educated Roman and an intimate friend of the conqueror. But it has been generally held on the strength of the traditional text of v. 9, and the statement in the anonymous *Vita Tibulli*

ante alios Coruinum Messalam Or.
ingenue dilexit cuius contubernalis
Aquitano bello militaribus donis donatus
est¹

. oratorem] ingenue' is my correction for

that Tibullus also accompanied Messalla through his campaign in Aquitania. How those who hold this view with the vulgate reading and explanation of 4 (and 11) are to deal with the evidence disclosed in the course of the previous discussion, may be left to them to determine. On any hypothesis the theory rests upon a sufficiently precarious basis. An examination of the evidence for this campaign of Tibullus will show that part of it is derivative and part corrupt. The estimation of the data and authority of the 'Biography of Tibullus' is too long a task to be here undertaken, and it will form the subject of an appendix to my forthcoming selections from Tibullus now passing through the press. I will, however, anticipate so far as to say that this Life contains nothing which could not have been easily gathered from the statements of Tibullus about himself or of Horace about Albius, a writer of elegies who had been identified with Tibullus: and that the present case is no exception, the biographer having obtained his fact from the verse of this poem in its vulgate form. If the evidence of the biographer be but second-hand, there remains only the line of Tibullus, and this we need not hesitate to pronounce corrupt. What would Germany have said of the aide de camp who in the middle of a recital professedly in honour of von Moltke's conduct of the war of 1870 had uttered the 'proud words,'² 'not without me was your distinction gained,' and then proceeded to appeal to the several battle-fields for confirmation of his indecent vaunt. A howl of reprobation would have risen from the whole of the German press.

And of all persons in the world it is the diffident and retiring Tibullus who is forced to thrust himself into the foreground of his friend's achievements at the very moment that he is celebrating them. To avoid this objection it has been proposed to take *non sine me* in the sense of 'with my companionship.' But this is a desperate device to exclude the idea of participation and could never have occurred to any one who had

the 'originem' of the MSS. (*Journal of Philology*, 28 (1901), p. 159). Professor Purser has suggested to me since 'or. unice,' which would also do. The other emendations proposed are all very improbable.

² F. Marx in the article 'Albius' in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopædie*, i. 1322: 'T. war gewiss ein tapferer Soldat wenn er nach der Vita von einem Messalla *militaribus donis donatus est* und zu dem Triumphantor die stolzen Worte *non sine me est tibi partus honos* sprechen durfte.' A brave soldier possibly, but hardly a modest one.

not seen that the plain meaning of the words was impossible.¹

While repudiating for Tibullus the gross ignorance of Gallic geography which has been attributed to him, we must at the same time point out that his poems show no trace of his having ever visited the country. There are no facts referred to in the present passage that might not have been gathered from common rumour or the lips of his friend. It is needless to account in any other way for his knowing that the Rhone was swift and the estuary of the Garunna broad. One specific statement indeed he makes which, if correct, might be held to point to a different conclusion. He says that the waters of the Loire are 'blue'; and, with the vulgate reading and the ordinary interpretation, he must be deemed to have visited them because he calls this river amongst others to witness that he was in Messalla's company. I have taken and given some trouble to discover the colour of the waters of the Loire, and I can find nothing to show that they are blue in any part of their course.

Of the Loire at its mouth M. Charles Barrois, for the knowledge of whose paper I am indebted to Prof. T. McKenny Hughes, writes thus in the *Annales de la Société Géologique du Nord*, vol. 24, p. 207:

'Sous son influence et celle du courant littoral on voit les eaux jaunâtres de la Loire² longer la côte au nord, se répandre le long du Morbihan et former une longue traînée qui va se perdre au N.W.'

The waters of the Upper Loire, when floods and man permit, appear to be limpid. I quote first from the article in the great *Dictionnaire géographique et administratif de la France* of P. Joanne, vol. ii. 1894, s.v. *Loire*, p. 2236 col. 3 of the Loire entering the department of the Haute-Loire 'il y fuit, clair et rapide,' further on 2237 col. 1 'limpide sur un lit de pierre.' Still further on of the Loire near Orleans the writer speaks of 'les sables roulés par le fleuve' (p. 2240, col. 2) and of the Loire in the department of Maine et Loire (p. 2242, col. 1) we have 'Fleuve inégal entre tous et capricieux—masse immense, trouble et jaunée tout d'un coup grossie par l'irruption simultanée d'affluents à forte pente, ou nappes

limpide miroitant entre deux grèves blanches' (Célestin Port). Of the Loire below Montjean we read p. 2243 col. 1 'En hiver quand la terre est dépouillée, quand la Loire roule ses eaux jaunes ce doit être lugubre (Ardouin-Dumazab).' To these testimonies I will add that of an English eye-witness, for which I am indebted to Mr. G. A. Macmillan, who, speaking of the river between Angers and Tours, gives his recollections as follows: 'The waters were very low, it being August, but were limpid, borrowing here and there the colours of the yellow (with a faint touch of grey) of the sand which in places shewed dry in the shallow stream.'

Tibullus is the only classic who has anything descriptive of the Liger: but Venantius Fortunatus (sixth century A.D.), the biographer of St. Martin of Tours, calls it more than once 'glassy'; uita S. Martini 4. 298, carm. 5. 7. 7 '*vitrea* Liger algidus unda,' *ib.* 6. 5. 233 sq.

The 'blue' Loire then would appear to have no support in literature or fact.

Out of this difficulty Gruppe's *garrula*³ is indeed a way but one which no one has accepted or, as I imagine, will accept. The juxtaposition *flavi caerulea*, whatever we may think of its taste, stamps *caerulea* as genuine. A yellow-haired Gaul by a blue-watered stream is the sort of thing we might expect from the Roman fancy for *uarietas* or colour-contrasts. An exact parallel is the black Indian by the red sea of iii. 8 (iv. 2) 19 '*et quascumque niger rubro de litore gemmas proximus Eois colligit Indus equis.*' For the combination of two epithets compare ii. 5. 38 '*niueae candidus agnus ovis.*'

Tibullus had no more seen the Liger than he had seen the Cydnus, which, as I have on the authority of Prof. W. M. Ramsay, is 'in its upper course a bright clear mountain stream.'⁴ The corruption which we have been engaged in exposing is satisfactorily removed by Baehrens' emendation 'non sine *marte* *ibi* partus honos.' This to my mind receives considerable confirmation from the words of the 'Panegyricus' in the place already quoted '*bellis experta cano.*' Mr. Housman (*ad loc.* on the Corpus text of Tibullus) has proposed in the same sense 'non sine *re* est tibi partus honos.' *re* is

¹ And so, if my view of the Biography is correct, it did not occur to its writer, whose account of what he thought had happened is a very natural inference from the traditional text and the known relations of Tibullus and Messalla.

² Italics are mine.

³ In the text of his *Römische Elegie*. He does not give any reasons for the change in his note.

⁴ No one however has maintained that Tibullus describes Asia as an eyewitness. As we know from I. iii. he fell ill when accompanying Messalla to Asia and was left behind at Coreyra.

somewhat nearer to the letters, but in other respects it is inferior to the previous correction which is neither improbable in itself nor, from the changes which it assumes, devoid of a special plausibility when manuscripts of Tibullus are in question.

If we accept Baehrens' conjecture and interpret the next distich as reason requires, a difficulty which has been lurking all the time in the context starts up at once to confront us. The following lines and everything in the sequel deal with Messalla's achievements in peace—his mission to Asia and his works in Italy. But there is not a word to mark the transition. I conceive then that a couplet has fallen out between 10 and 11, the sense of which was this. 'Yet your successes in the field, Messalla, are equalled or surpassed by your exploits as a reorganiser and administrator.' Compare the division of the Panegyrist 39 sq. 'nam quis te maiora gerit castrisue foroue? nec tamen hic aut hic tibi laus maiorue minorue' Messalla's forensic eminence being

the subject of 45 sqq. and his 'bellicae laudes' that of 81 sqq.¹

That a couplet necessary for the orderly treatment of the subject has been lost seems an easier assumption than the one which is otherwise demanded, to wit that Messalla fought Aquitanians, properly or improperly so called, on all the rivers in question.

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ Mr. Housman (Corpus Tibullus, note *ad loc.*) has suggested the loss of a pentameter and hexameter between 13 and 14 where there is certainly some corruption in the MS. text. Had Tibullus smooth water on the brain to this extent of selecting this characteristic for two rivers in succession? I doubt it. The best remedy seems to be to read *placidae—aquae* and to refer it to the Rhegma as Strabo calls it, the sense being that the 'blue' Cydnus flows so peacefully to the sea that its colour alone betrays its passage through the still and shallow lagoon. The ablative would be due to some scribe who understood neither the construction nor the allusion. The heaping up of expressions for the same idea is in itself no proof of corruption; cf. Tib. ii. 1. 80, 'placidus leniter,' Ov. Pont. 4. 10. 54 'et tacite peragens lene Melanthus iter,' Sen. H. F. 580 'placida quiete labitur Lethe uado.' But 'tacitus undis' and 'placidis aquis' of the same water seems impossible.

THE SOURCE OF DANTE'S EUNOË.

MISS HARRISON's 'Query' (*C.R.*, February 1903, p. 58) as to whence Dante borrowed his *Eunoë*, puts a very interesting and difficult question. The question first occurred to me when I was preparing a course of lectures on Plato's Myths which I delivered in Oxford four years ago. In one of these lectures I called attention, as Miss Harrison now does, to the close analogy between the mythology of the Petelia Tablet (Kaibel, *I.G.S.I.*, No. 638, and Comparetti, *J.H.S.* iii. 111) and Dante's mythology of the twin streams, Lethe and *Eunoë*, in *Purg.* xxviii. 130, and subsequent passages. I found that Dante was true to mythological data at his disposal in placing Lethe in, or near, Elysium or the Earthly Paradise, and making it a stream, not subterranean, but on the surface of the earth; but I pointed out that there was no evidence to show that he had any knowledge of the Orphic mythology of the twin streams as we have it in the Petelia inscription. Nor could we suppose that he knew of Pausanias' mention (ix. 39) of the streams of Lethe and Mnemosyne at the entrance of the cave of Trophonius; although it was possible that he might have seen Pliny *H.N.* xxxi. 15. I thought it safest to

allow that Dante, taking the general idea of streams encircling the Earthly Paradise from *Genesis*, and the idea of Lethe as one of these streams from *Aen.* vi., might have hit, quite independently of mythological tradition, on the very natural idea of a stream of Memory to contrast with the stream of Oblivion, although his description of the attributes of *Eunoë* as stream of Memory, certainly resembles Platonic and Neo-platonic passages in which the process of *káθαρσις* is identified with that of *ἀνάμνησις*. I ventured, however, to make a suggestion with regard to the name *Eunoë* (not a name obviously appropriate to the stream of Memory), which, if it goes in the right direction at all, perhaps does not go very far. I offer it here again for what it may be worth, as a contribution to the subject.

Starting from the lines in the Petelia Tablet, in which the deceased *μύσσης* appeals to the *φύλακες* of the fountain:—

δάφνη δ' εἰμί αὖθι καὶ ἀπόλλυμαι· ἀλλὰ δότ' αἶψα
ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ προρέον τῆς Μνημοσύνης ἀπὸ
λίμνης·
καὶ τοί σοι δώσουσι πιεῖν θέλεις ἀπ' ὅ κρήνης,
καὶ τότ' ἔπειτ' ἄλλουσι μεθ' ἡρώεσσιν ἀνάξει[s].

I supposed that Dante's use of the name Eunoë might have some connexion with the idea of *refrigerium* which apparently found its way into Christian literature (cf. *Par.* xiv. 27, *Lo refrigerio dell' eterna ploia*—Tertullian *Apologeticus* xxxix. *inopes quosque refrigerio isto* (i.e. the Lord's Supper) *juvamus*), from the early Christian epitaphs which reproduce the *ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ* of the pagan epitaphs. I had in view such pagan epitaphs as the following published by Kaibel and referred to by Dieterich in his *Nekyia* and Rohde in his *Psyche*:—*ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ δόξῃ σοι ἀναξ ἐνέπων Αἰδωνεύς* (Kaibel *I.G.* 1842)—*ἐψύχῃ καὶ δόξῃ σοι ὁ Οὐσιπὸς τὸ ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ* (Kaibel, *I.G.* 1488)—*D.M. IVLIA POLITICE DOESE OSIRIS TO PSYCHRON HYDOR* (Kaibel, *I.G.* 1705), and such Christian epitaphs as *in refrigerio et pace anima tua—Deus te refrigeret—spiritum tuum Dominus refrigeret* (quoted by Rohde *Psy.* ii. 391 and Dieterich *Nek.* 95). I supposed that the name Eunoë—*εὐνοῖα*, *benevolentia*—was chosen by Dante, or rather by an unknown authority from whom he borrowed it, to indicate that a boon was graciously bestowed by God through the water of this stream—the *boon* of *refrigerium*—*ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ δόξῃ σοι ἀναξ ἐνέπων*

Αἰδωνεύς—Dominus te refrigeret. Dante's Eunoë would thus mean the Stream of the Loving Kindness and Grace of God.

Until Miss Harrison's *Ε[ὐ]νοῖας* (after Comparetti's *ε[ὐ]νοῖας*) has been proved to belong to the original text of Kaibel, *I.G.S.I.* 642, and the reference in that inscription has been shown to be certainly to the Orphic *Κρήνη Μνημοσύνης*, it will be enough to admit that an Orphic writer in the third century B.C. might very naturally speak of the *φύλακες* of the well of Memory as *εἶνοι* towards those *μύσται* on whom they bestowed *τὸ ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ*, or *refrigerium*, and that he might very naturally describe that well itself as *Εἰνοῖας κρήνη*—the Fountain of Loving Kindness.

Considering the probable descent through epitaphs of the Christian *refrigerium* (the idea of which makes itself felt in the lines with which the *Purgatorio* ends) from the Orphic *ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ*, I am inclined to think that it is to Christian epitaphs that we ought to go for the more immediate source of Dante's Eunoë. If the word were found there in connexion with *refrigerium*, we might infer with some confidence that it had occurred in Orphic epitaphs.

J. A. STEWART.

REVIEWS.

BELLING ON HORACE.

Studien über die Liederbücher des Horatius.
Von H. BELLING. (Berlin: 1903. 188 pp.
Gärtner's Verlagsbuchh.) 5 M.

THIS is a study of the art of Horace, not as poet, but as bookmaker, if I may employ that word in its literal sense. Mr. Belling has observed that there are 10 eclogues of Vergil, 10 poems in the First Book of Tibullus, 10 Satires in the First Book of Horace, 20 Epistles in the First Book, 20 Odes in the Second Book of Odes, 30 in the Third, 15 in the Fourth, and he notices that all these numbers are divisible by 5. He concludes that this is no accident, but that the Augustan poets, in collecting their compositions for publication, put them together in groups of 5 or 10, pentads or decads, arranged on some artistic principle which can be discovered by close investigation. He has already written on Tibullus

and Propertius, and is now prepared to explain why each ode of Horace comes by its place. The poet, he admits, wrote his odes on all sorts of occasions, but, in collecting them, he had an eye either to similarity or contrast, either of subject or metre, either within the pentad or decad itself or between different pentads or decads. It need hardly be said that, with all this choice of principles, Mr. Belling is never at a loss for a good reason. Like a man playing at noughts and crosses by himself, he is always sure of winning. It happens, indeed, that there are 38 Odes in the First Book, but this accident does not provoke Mr. Belling out of his common-sense. He can explain it in many ways. Thus, if Horace published all his pieces at once and the number of pieces was not divisible by 5, some book was bound to suffer, and why not the First? Again, Mr.

Belli
so th
I. is
first
epilo
is of
Or,
is g
into
men
likel
B.C.
and
of t
I. 3
and
first
awa
he s
expl
prin
befo
labo
diffi
to b
iam
into
expl
conv
who
Mr.
not

P. C
er
La
Few
have
expo
mar
of a
Amo
talit
ing
edit
it d
lies
Art
the
writ
for
It w
made

Belling, is confident that I. 20 is spurious, so that the true number of Odes in Book I. is 37, not 38. Deduct from this the first Ode and the last, as prologue and epilogue, and the remainder is 35, which is obviously one decad and five pentads. Or, if anyone prefers to think that I. 20 is genuine, he may divide the 38 Odes into the following symmetrical arrangement, 6, 5, 5, 6, 5, 5, 6. But it is likely that I. 3 was not written till B.C. 19, when Vergil went to Greece, and was not included in the first edition of the book. In that case, if we omit I. 3 and also I. 38, as not yet written, and reject I. 20, we have from the first only 35 Odes. Mr. Belling is quite aware that, if he omits or inserts any ode, he alters the order of the rest and must explain the new order on quite different principles from those that he employed before, but he does not shrink from this labour. The book of Epodes too causes difficulty, for there are 17 of them, but it is to be observed that the first 10 are all iambic and the remaining 7 can be brought into a symmetrical arrangement. As the explanation of this is complicated and not convincing to me, I shall refer the reader who wishes to be educated in such things to Mr. Belling himself. I should, however, not omit to remark that the book is not

one which can be read running, for the argument is always intricate and requires a most intimate knowledge of Horace, and the style is of that honest German sort which is always anxious to preclude the possibility of mistake. If Mr. Belling has a reservation or qualification to make, he makes it on the spot and does not leave it for a new sentence. Here is a sample of observations that are to be found on almost every page:

'In pedantisch-nüchtern erfasster Wirklichkeit würde an solchem Orte der Page freilich vergebens laufen, ut devium scortum eliceret domo Lyden; denn die—an sich ganz unbedenkliche—Annahme von Th. Plüss (Horazstudien S. 168) der Dichter stelle sich—ähnlich wie III. 28—eine Lyde (nicht die Lyde, deren "Lebenslauf" G. Friedrich, in abgethane Fehler zurückfallend, S. 1 Anm. zu reconstituieren vermeint) als in dem Hause des Landguts weilend vor, findet in dem Wortlaut von v. 21 f. meines Erachtens nicht genügenden Anhalt.'

The book concludes with a number of notes on particular passages, mostly in favour of traditional readings or interpretations (e.g. *Apulius* and *Apulicum* in III. 4. 10 and 24. 4). There are some novelties: e.g. in II. 19. 23, 24 Mr. Belling regards *leonis unguibus horribilique mala* as a description of Rhoetus and, at III. 30. 2, *situs* as = *vetustas pyramidum*.

J. G.

BRANDT'S *ARS AMATORIA* OF OVID.

P. Ovidi Nasonis de arte amandi. Libri tres erklärt von PAUL BRANDT. Dietrich, Leipzig. 1902. Pp. 256. 8 M.

FEW books of the world-famous kind have so long been waiting for an adequate exponent as the *Ars Amatoria*. It is remarkable that this, the most read perhaps of all Ovid's works, and if we except the *Amores*, the most deserving of that immortality which the poet predicted as awaiting him in the future, has never been edited with anything like the completeness it deserves. The cause of this, no doubt, lies on the surface. It is not merely the Art of love which Ovid has treated, but the art of the lover, in other words he has written a manual of the most practical kind for the everyday purposes of the seducer. It was not without reason that Augustus made the *Ars Amatoria* the pretext of the

poet's banishment, however certain it may be that it was *only* the pretext. When we think of the small interval which separates the high moral tone of the Odes of Horace from this work of his successor, it seems almost incredible that each should belong to the principate of the same man. Why, we ask did not Augustus at once show his disapproval? Nothing could be in more direct opposition to one of his chief aims, the establishment of a chaster moral tone. We must, however, remember that Tibullus and Propertius had made love a popular subject even in the earlier and severer part of Augustus' long reign; that Ovid had himself published his *Amores* seemingly as early as 19 B.C. (death of Tibullus) certainly not later than 15 B.C.: that the *Amores* at once became so popular that all Rome was asking 'who is Corinna?', and that, when the *Ars* appeared many years later, probably

(as Schanz thinks) in the first or second year of our era, Ovid was and had long been the most famous poet of his time. Even the omnipotent master of the Roman world might well shrink from attacking such a man; a man who had done much to make his Empire and the imperial house popular; let us add, who had made the Roman language known through the entire empire by the unequalled finish and perfection of the series of poems which he had consecrated to the most popular of all the subjects of poetry, love.

Ovid himself in the second book of his *Tristia*, by the elaborate and lengthy defence of his *Ars*, seems to show that it must have been one, if not the chief, cause of his relegation to Tomi. But it cannot have been more: for the poet himself tells us with the greatest openness that the real cause was something he had *seen*; in other words that he had witnessed some act (certainly not the Empress Livia bathing) which it was dangerous to know. We may therefore exculpate the *Ars* on this head: it would not by itself have caused the poet's relegation; but it was a convenient pretext, under which that act of stern severity might seem to find its justification.

In the preface to his edition, Brandt disclaims anything like finality or exhaustiveness. His aim is to give an intelligible and easily accessible explanation and illustration of a famous work, in the best manner of Ovid's earlier and more polished style. We are therefore not much surprised to find that nothing new has been done as regards the criticism of the text. Ehwald is followed throughout, and no new examination of MSS. has been attempted, though much yet remains to be done. Indeed the MS. criticism not only of the *A.A.* but of the *Remedia* and *Amores* still calls for a much larger investigation than any one since Heinsius has been able to give to them; we have as yet no edition even which presents a *complete* collation of the three best MSS.; in which particular these works of the poet stand at a decided disadvantage if compared with the *Heroides* or *Medicamina Faciei*, neither of them at all rising to the same level of poetical importance.

Brandt's commentary has great merits. Without being long or prolix it generally gives as much elucidation of historical and archaeological points as most readers require. Ovid is, as a rule, easier than Propertius, and only now and then (e.g. in *games*) obscure, or calling for anything like prolonged disquisition. An excellent

feature in Brandt's notes is the even-handed citation of parallels from Greek as well as Latin writers; see for instance the note on ἀπποδίδωρος ὄρκος p. 54, on the little-known Amoebeus p. 173, on the proverb *occultae musicae nullus est respectus* (ib.) There is perhaps hardly enough notice of grammatical or syntactical points e.g. the use of *non* in III. 129 *Vos quoque non caris aures oneratis lapillis*, followed by *nec* in 131 *nec prodite graues insuto uestibus auro*: I. 389 *Aut non temptaris aut perferes*; but this would perhaps be foreign to the plan of the work proposed to himself by the author. Nor can I approve of the frequent parentheses which Merkel introduced and Ehwald has left unaltered, e.g. II. 79, 80 *Iam Samos a dextra (fuerant Naxosque relictae Et Paros et Clario Delos amata deo), Dextra Lebinthos erat*; III. 51, 52 *Si bene te noui (cultas ne laede puellas) Gratia, dum uiues ista petenda tibi*: nor of the shortened *fuerunt* III. 405.6 *Cura deum fuerunt olim regumque poetae Praemiaque antiqui magna tulere chori*, for *fuerant* is not only the reading of the most authoritative MSS., but is made nearly certain by *olim*; the substitution of such shortened perfects has gone too far in many recent editions of Latin poetry, and will be found very often in conflict with the MS. tradition. On metrical grounds too the elision of *i* in *Lemniasi* et III. 672 should have been defended; it is at any rate very unusual. Few will agree, again, to accept Madvig's correction, II. 217 *Sine fatigata praebendo monstra nouerca Qui meruit caelum, quod prior ipse tulit*, where R gives *fatigatae praebendo m. nouercae*, other MSS. *premendo* or *perimendo*, which latter was restored by Heinsius and is rightly printed in Merkel's earlier editions. The change from the genitive *fatigatae* . . . *nouercae* to the abl. *fatigata* . . . *nouerca* seems unsupported by any MS., and is improbable. As I am here attacking one of Madvig's corrections of the *Ars*, I may say that this great critic appears to very little advantage in his corrections of the same work elsewhere. No one I imagine can believe Ovid guilty of such a metrical monstrosity as *Praeceptis, Priami, si foret usa tuis* (III. 440), where *Priami* is vocative of *Priamis* (Cassandra) and must have its final vowel short. I am glad to see that Brandt has not allowed himself to be led away into writing either *Priamē* (Madvig's original correction) or *Priamī* (his subsequent); forsaking R which gives *tuis*, Brandt prints with most edd. *Praeceptis Priami si foret usa sui*, confessing however to a difficulty in under-

standing to what the poet refers. This verse is a very *crux* of criticism. Brandt has done a most real service in calling marked attention to it: but the problem cannot be considered solved. It is sad that the early Bodleian Welsh MS. of the *Ars* (Bradshaw thought it of cent. ix) contains only the first book, and does not help us here.

In an even more doubtful passage, I. 731, (unfortunately omitted in the Welsh MS.) which Brandt prints thus *Pallidus in Side siluis errabat Orion*, MSS. give no warrant

for *Side*. R (Paris 7311) has *linces sillius e. orion* (not *orion*, which however seems to be the reading of the mass of MSS.) Of those which I have looked at, D'Orv. 170 (of cent. xii) has *linca* (a over an erasure, in darker ink, *c* might be *o*); Can. Lat. 1 (saec. xiii) has *linca*, but in a marginal note *lineam*; Auct. Rawl. G. 108 has *lincem*; Auct. F. i. 18 dated 1483 *lyricem*. No nymph or female with a name like this has yet been discovered; the daughter of Oenopion, of whom Orion was enamoured, is called sometimes *Merope*, sometimes (as by Parthenius) *Haero* (*Aero* Knaack), sometimes *Aerope*; *Side* was his first wife, but he is not said to have been specially fond of her. It is I think clear that neither of these is intended by Ovid. Meanwhile the coincidence of the name in the best MSS. with the *lynxes* which Horace says were (with lions) the main objects of Orion's hunting, is very perplexing; for the pentameter which immediately follows *Pallidus in lenta Naidē Daphnis erat* (732) points unmistakably to a similar ablative in 731. There is a general consensus in all the variants mentioned by Heinsius on the passage as to the name beginning with *l*; but it seems not beyond possibility that a *c* or *g* may have fallen out before *l* in a very early period of the transmission of the *Ars*, possibly (C)lytie. The nearest actual

approach to the word which I have discovered is *Lyca*, the name of a nymph who loved the shepherd Daphnis (Philargyrius on Ecl. v. 20); but the *y* of *Lyca* would be short, nor can the *n* of *Lynce* or *Lynca* be easily put aside.

I confess to a little disappointment in not finding what I think a very probable emendation of my own in II. 305-8 not mentioned by Brandt. I published it in the American Journal of Philology for 1892 p. 343 with some other suggestions on Ovid.

Bracchia saltantis, uocem mirare canentis,

Et quod desiderit uerba querentis habet.

Ipsos concubitus, ipsum uenerere licebit

Quod iuuat et †quaedam gaudia noctis habet.

I regard *quaedam* as one of the many cases where *d* has been written for *cl*, *quaedam* for *quae clam*. Then *habet* will become either *habet*, or *habet* (sc. puella). *Clam habere* = *occulere*: *licebit uenerere ipsam uoluptatem coitus et gaudia ueneris quae taces* (tacet).

III. 287, 8

Est quae peruerso distorqueat ora cachinno,

Cum risu †usa est altera, flere putes.

The conjecture of Rappold *quassa est* is good in itself, yet not very likely to have been corrupted into *usa est*. I suggest either *cum risu uisa est altera*, 'another has been seen laughing', or *cum* (when) *risu fusa est altera*, f. p.

It will be seen from the above remarks how much has still to be done for the *A.A.*, as well as for the other directly amatory works of Ovid. Brandt's new edition cannot fail to make this more sensibly felt: I am even in hopes that we may soon possess something like an adequate conspectus of the primary sources of the text of these very interesting poems.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

BOTSFORD'S ANCIENT HISTORY.

An Ancient History for Beginners. By GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD, Ph.D. The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. 494. 7s. 6d.

DR. BOTSFORD in his preface tells us that this book 'is intended for pupils who have

never studied history before,' and is meant to furnish material for a year's work to 'beginning classes in the high school.' The statement helps us to understand one or two omissions strange at first sight, and to appreciate the success with which the

writer has adapted his book to its special purpose, a task not often accomplished so skilfully. Among the omissions, one notices the entire absence of Theramenes. Sulpicius is not named in the sketch of the events of 88 B.C., and no doubt Dr. Botsford was right in simplifying as far as possible the intricacies of that difficult time. There seems to be less necessity for leaving out the 'Knights' and the jury-courts in speaking of Gaius Gracchus and the changes he introduced (p. 353), and this omission is perhaps regrettable, especially as attention has been drawn to the previous community of interest between culprit and judges in trials *repetundarum* (p. 339).

But the most noteworthy omission of all is the absence of that dulness which is so hard to exclude from compressed text-books, and the history is excellent, a book for which one may well be grateful to its author. The matters of real importance are selected and made prominent with a sureness of touch that shows both historical insight and much careful work guided by a teacher's experience. The balance is well maintained between the personal and dramatic elements in history on the one hand, and on the other the influences of geographical position, tendencies of an age, general character of a race or state. Such short notices as those of Dionysios (§ 160), Agesilaos (§ 167), Flaminius (§ 277), the Gracchi (§ 281)—to name a few among many—make the men real and interesting persons. Again, the nature of a City State (§ 65) of an Amphiktyony (§ 66), the bond between a Greek colony and its metropolis (§ 63), the relations of Thebes, Argos, Athens, Sparta, to their surrounding districts (§ 68), the effects of geographical conditions on Italian history (§ 215), are some of the more general topics that are treated briefly but clearly. The girls and boys who use this book should have at the close of their year's work upon it a good outline in their minds of the main features in the histories of Greece and Rome; and they must be dull indeed if they are not kindled to an interest in the subject that will make them want to learn more about those two states.

Greece and Rome in their best days occupy the bulk of the book. Forty pages at the beginning are given to a sketch of Oriental history from the fifth millennium B.C., forty three near the end carry us from Diocletian to Charlemagne. These outlines may be made very useful by a good teacher; but the central part of the book tells its story well even by itself. Teachers are,

however, encouraged to supplement, 'Topics for Reading' being suggested at the end of each chapter.

Turning to political questions, we find that Dr. Botsford believes strongly in the necessity and advantages of imperial rule at Rome. He has little sympathy with Greek oligarchies, and holds that the history of both Athens and Rome has been somewhat distorted by passing through an aristocratic or oligarchic medium. He takes the view that Kleon 'had a remarkable talent for finance and was an orator of great force' (p. 164). The decemvir Appius Claudius was 'a man of rare intelligence and ability' (p. 303), and the fall of the body to which he belonged was due to its liberal policy (p. 304). In dealing with the early emperors, a very large discount from tradition is given. Not only is Claudius allowed to have been generous, wise, firm in punishing offenders and in protecting the frontiers (p. 393); even Domitian, whose traditional portrait is the most repulsive in the whole collection, is presented as a firm and able ruler of the provinces, his treatment of the Roman nobility being but slightly suggested (p. 398 f.). Tiberius one no longer expects to find set forth in that monstrous form for which Tacitus himself supplies corrections; and Dr. Botsford's estimate of him (p. 390) is particularly just and sensible.

Due attention is paid to the interesting topic of federal government in connexion with Greece and Rome; but in the desire to bring home to American readers the nature of the Italian union under Rome, Dr. Botsford goes too far when he speaks of it as a 'federal system' (p. 296). Freeman, in his *History of Federal Government*, calls attention to the 'quasi-Federal position of the allies,' but clearly points out how it differed from a real federation. This difference may indeed be gathered from the context in Dr. Botsford's book; but the relation between Rome and her allies is so hard for beginners to apprehend that there is danger in a phrase which seems to sum up the situation in familiar terms.

The treatment of the *Comitia Tributa* is not very satisfactory. Our author starts with the view—to my mind highly improbable—that the *Comitia Tributa* and 'the plebeian assembly of tribes' were identical (pp. 302, 304, 311); he tells us nothing of any other assembly by tribes, and then suddenly (p. 360) we find under Sulla the tribal assembly electing the new members

of the Senate. Surely it was not a purely plebeian assembly that did this? yet the beginner in history would be justified in supposing that it was.

As to the spelling of Greek names and other Greek words, I cannot but repeat the protest I made in reviewing Dr. Botsford's History of Greece. And we are again instructed to pronounce 'Sikyon' as 'Sishion' (p. 103, and Index), a pronunciation recommended neither by correctness nor by beauty.

A few more dates would be helpful. Plato and Sophokles are left undated, though dates are given for Aischylos. Again, that battle at the Colline Gate in which the Samnite ox seemed so near trampling down the Roman wolf, should be marked by an exact date; perhaps also the battle of Thapsus or that of Munda. It might be well to give more often the quantities of Greek and Latin words, especially such words as 'Cle-om¹-e-nes,' in which the accent, which is marked, tends

to produce a false quantity. Unfortunately, in one of the few cases in which a quantity is given, the mark has been shifted by a printer's error to a wrong syllable, 'hegemōny' being printed (p. 76). Of such small mistakes I have detected very few: on p. 194, '287' has taken the place of '387' at the beginning of § 159, and on the maps in the Roman part the references given to other maps have not been altered to suit the present volume.

Throughout the history, quotations from original authorities are introduced with excellent effect. Pictures and maps are liberally scattered, and increase the usefulness as well as the attractiveness of this very attractive book. The pictures are remarkably good, some of the representations of statuary and vase-paintings giving a better idea of the beauty of the originals than one would have supposed it possible to convey by illustrations on so small a scale.

M. ALFORD.

THUMB'S HANDBUCH DER Koinē.

Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus; Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurtheilung der koinē. Von ALBERT THUMB. Strassburg, 1901. Pp. iv + 275. 8vo. 7 M.

THIS learned publication is a very acceptable and valuable contribution to our meagre knowledge of post-classical and subsequent Greek speech, a form of language recently dubbed by the misnomer *koinē*. It is to be regretted that this term *koinē* has been adopted also by Prof. P. Kretschmer in a paper on 'Die Entstehung der Koine,' published contemporaneously and independently in the *Wiener Sitzungsberichte* (vol. 143 X. pp. 1-40): a very meritorious and painstaking essay which has been issued also separately and which I recommend to all students of Greek, alike classical and modern.

Prof. Thumb's Handbuch of the so-called *koinē* consists of six separate papers or Beiträge purporting to discuss and illustrate the character and historical evolution of the said *koinē*.—In paper I (pp. 1-27) Prof. Thumb reviews the multifarious modern views and applications of the term *koinē*, and concludes by proposing to use it synonymously with 'Hellenistic Greek'

(p. 9), applying either term to that form of Greek speech which was commonly current from 300 B.C. to about 500 A.D. (p. 6), or to the language generally spoken in ordinary intercourse from the time of Alexander the Great to the end of Greek antiquity (p. 7). Within the *koinē* so defined, Prof. Thumb further distinguishes two periods of about 300 years each, then within each period again speaks of a literary and a colloquial *koinē*, and later on (p. 160 ff.) discriminates no less than five dialects within the *koinē*. Continuing his general remarks, the writer in the same paper points out the close connection of modern with classical Greek and the great value of present speech both for the study of the *koinē* and the critical edition of classical Greek texts. The value and importance of modern Greek is, moreover, emphasised throughout the book.—In paper II (pp. 28-52) the author cites a few ancient testimonies to the survival of the old dialects in post-classical antiquity, then discusses the gradual spread of the *koinē* in the inscriptions, especially in Rhodes, and attributes the phenomenon to the natural evolution of living speech.—Paper III (53-101) speaks of the influence of the *koinē* on the Attic dialect (*Koinisierung des*

Attischen, p. 58), indicates the various dialectal and Atticistic elements contained in the *κοινή* as well as in modern Greek, and closes by again urging the study of modern Greek for the knowledge of the ancient dialects.—Paper IV (pp. 102—161) speaks of the influence of alien races on the formation and evolution of the Hellenistic language in Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, an influence which he finds limited to a small number of oriental words met with in papyri and literary compositions, and still largely preserved in modern Greek. Here Prof. Thumb assumes that Asia Minor served as the starting point for the great majority of the Hellenistic and modern Greek phenomena, though he admits that Latin also played a considerable part in the process.—In Paper V (pp. 162—201) the author distinguishes within the *κοινή* the five dialectal varieties already referred to, then seeks to determine the relation of the *κοινή* to Biblical and Christian compositions, and recommends a critical investigation of the modern Greek dialects.—In Paper VI (pp. 202—253), entitled 'Origin and character of the *κοινή*,' Prof. Thumb quotes some previous views on the origin of the *κοινή*, then adduces specimens of the Hellenistic vocabulary, considers the influence of Ionic on the *κοινή*, as well as the effects of history, especially that of Alexander's conquests, and the part played by Hellenistic countries (e.g. Asia Minor and Egypt) in the evolution of the *κοινή*.—The last 20 pp. are occupied by two serviceable indexes.

So far then Prof. Thumb's book covers a very wide field, and touches a great number of problems. Unfortunately it only touches but does not solve these questions, inasmuch as the actual data—the solid matter underlying his studies—are so insufficient and inconsiderable that they might be easily and conveniently condensed to one score of pages. This being the case, unless otherwise self-evident, the conclusions arrived at by the writer, however tempting, remain still to be proved, and many a critical reader would value the book more highly if it contained more solid matter and real facts than subjective speculations on 'principielle Fragen.' Such tempting speculations might be excusable in the case of a dilettant *littérateur*, but do not heighten the credit and authority of such a sound scholar as Prof. Thumb, who has spoiled us by his previous painstaking publications, notably his *Untersuchungen über den Spiritus asper*, and his *Handbuch der neugriechischen Sprache*. Nor can we forget that, next to the

lamented Gustav Meyer and Prof. Kretschmer, the author of the above book is a leading authority in Germany on the post-classical and subsequent history of the Greek language, and that his thorough familiarity with modern Greek speech entitles us to expect always from him wide, thorough and systematic scholarship. In the present case we find that, in point of detail, the author is rarely guilty of errors, unless we insist on absolute accuracy even in modern Greek. For here among the terms quoted as modern Greek, *εἰκαιῶ* and *μεσολαβῶ* (p. 212), *ζγκνος* (225 f.) *ἀρσενικός* (15, 77 f. and 242), *κορμός* (218), *ἀνάβα* and *κατάβα* (207), *ἐξολοθρεῖω* (212), *κοινολογία* and *κοινολογῶ* (213, 270), *τέτταρες* (180), and such like, are not surviving colloquialisms, but cases of literary revival, or neologisms due to literary influence. Nor is the author right in insisting that the modern Greek *νερό* (water) comes from *νεαρὸν* (*ἕδωρ*); it is only the rare by-form *νιαρὸ* or *νεαρὸ* that may go back to *νεαρός*, whereas the universal form *νερό* cannot possibly have any other direct progenitor than *νηρόν* (*ἕδωρ*).—However, slips like these are but few and insignificant as compared with the numerous pearls scattered in almost every page of the book. The case is different with the system adopted. Any attentive reader, after perusing a few pages of the book, will find that the same views and statements are over and again repeated throughout the book, and confess that it proves inadequate to its title. As already stated, it consists of a series of separate papers, originally intended, as it would seem, for a periodical, but subsequently recast and issued in the form of a book. It is this accidental origin of the work that may account for the infelicitous title *κοινή* adopted, seeing that, had the author gone more carefully into the question, he would have found that the ancients never speak of a *κοινή* without *διάλεκτος* (or *λέξις*), and that, which is most important, when they refer to this *κοινή διάλεκτος*, they never mean the vernacular or *Umgangssprache* but, as we have shown in a previous page of this Review (p. 94), the *non-dialectal model language* of such prose-writers as the orators. This being the case, we doubt whether well-informed readers, particularly if they are Germans, will thank the author for his pet terms *κοινή* or *koinē* and *Koinisierung* dished up right and left through all the pages of this otherwise very acceptable book.

A. N. JANNARIS.

TUCKER'S *CHOEPHORI* OF AESCHYLUS.*A Rejoinder.*

χαλεπὸν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα μὴ διαμαρτάνειν ἐν πολλοῖς, τὰ μὲν ὅλως ἀγνοήσαντα, τὰ δὲ κακῶς κρίναντα, τὰ δὲ ἀμελέστερον γράψαντα. A salutary reflection, even for a reviewer.

I may perhaps be permitted to doubt whether the archididascalian tone adopted by Mr. W. Headlam is warranted by a comparison of our respective records in the world of Greek scholarship. It is true that at school we accept the form master's dogmatic statement that such and such a line is not metrical or not grammatical, but in the later republic of letters pretensions to dictatorship are scarcely tolerable :

τοῖς μὲν γὰρ παιδαρίοισιν
ἔστι διδάσκαλος ὅστις φράζει, τοῖς ἡβῶσιν δὲ—
ποιηταί.

Editors of classical works do not expect to be free from mistakes, but they do expect the reviewer to 'bring candid eyes unto the perusal of men's works, and let not zoilism or detraction blast well-intended labours.' I have read Mr. Headlam's article carefully in order to discover any one place in which he actually proves or disproves an assertion. I find no such place, and I humbly submit that the article therefore fails to serve any rational purpose. I must also be audacious enough to hold that in several most important departments of Greek scholarship—to wit, in the scientific study of grammar, in palaeographical knowledge, and in comprehension of Greek tragedy as literature and as practical drama—Mr. Headlam betrays very defective qualifications.

In the matter of Greek lyric metres in tragedy I do not here propose to argue with him. Intuition or direct revelation tells him (so I gather) that in this domain he possesses that ear which is 'a gift from God.' Unfortunately intuitions have little place in serious philology, in which demonstrable facts are generally demanded. Mr. Headlam appears to imagine that the facts of Greek lyric metres are now actually demonstrated. I have no belief of the kind and, until the day of certainty, I shall not feel bound by any particular schemes of longs, shorts, and irrations which may commend themselves to the divinely gifted ear of my critic. The day of (quite a different) certainty may possibly come to me also by grace of the Olympians: ἐπί τ' ὕμνων εὐρὼν

NO. CXLVII. VOL. XVIII.

ἀπαγγελέω. At present I may in all the modesty compatible with self-defence remark that I am probably in as full possession as Mr. Headlam of the more or less received traditions concerning dochmiacs and epitrites and the like. The trouble is that I am more sceptical about their relations and limitations. A judicial critic would recognise that this attitude is permissible. He might regret a disagreement, but would console himself with the proverb πλατεῖα κέλενθος.

That Mr. Headlam's attitude towards the Greek language, both as grammar and vocabulary, is unscientific and behind the times, and that his criteria in matters of emendation and interpretation are too purely subjective, needs little illustration to those *che sanno* (as he might put it). His quarrel with me is in reality a quarrel with a more cautious and rational school of philology. Thus to the mind of Mr. Headlam the Greek vocabulary has become by some process best known to himself, divided uncompromisingly into words which belong entirely to prose and words which are admissible in poetry. All of us make such a distinction, but we regard our lists as constantly open to revision. Mr. Headlam, however, puts himself above the evidence. The judicial philologist is content to examine the records and to base his conclusions upon them. In *Cho.* 914 the MS. has διχῶς, which makes excellent sense. Mr. Headlam calls this 'a purely prose word of the prosiest.' He was not alive in Athens in the year 458 B.C., but he is absolute on the point. Despite warnings which he might have drawn from the vocabulary of Shakspeare, Wordsworth, or even Tennyson, he 'corrects' διχῶς. Such a procedure is manifestly vicious. A doubt as to διχῶς may be intelligible, even if not very intelligent; but its removal from the text is quite another matter. The argument that, because *e.g.* πολλαχῶς is not found in a verse, therefore διχῶς must be ejected from a verse, has no basis in logic. ἐφ' ὁδοῦσαι, again, is a 'purely prose word.' The Medicean declares otherwise. 'But,' says Mr. Headlam in effect, 'the Medicean errs, and I do not.' In face of this attitude discussion is vain. If therefore I retain and explain a reading which is in the MS. but which Mr. Headlam does not like, I

K

claim firmly that my behaviour indicates no deficiency of scholarship but may quite as probably shew that I have a more intelligent and modest conception of the function of an editor.

My critic's handling of grammar is, I think, logically beyond defence. He complains that my belief in the 'elasticity' of the Greek tongue is 'a very different thing from what it was.' The statement, I am happy to admit, is true. It is well to continue learning. Time was when, like Mr. Headlam, I trusted my 'natural instinct for the language,' even if it conflicted with the practice of Greek writers. When youth has been duly fed on grammar-books and has revelled in the fascinating pages of the Cobetian uniformists, it is easy to decide precisely where an optative or a genitive can or cannot appear. Since those days I have, unfortunately for Mr. Headlam's approval of me, read the Greek authors in the only warrants which we possess for judging of their Greek. I have found them habitually and shamelessly flouting many of the choicest doctrines of the school grammarian. I have made large collections of the things which, so far as the evidence goes, they ventured to say, but which you would not have expected them to say, and for saying which Mr. Headlam would probably be exceedingly severe upon their little poetical, oratorical, or other literary exercises in the Greek tongue. After making these collections and pondering them, I feel that I am hardly confronted by serious scholarship when I am instructed that the proper word for 'how' is πῶς, still less when it is urged that if I can say δόμοις ἐπικάζειν I can also say τύπτω σοι. I presume that even Mr. Headlam will admit that τύπτω σοι τὸν παῖδα is Greek, and that the dative may be quite legitimately called a 'dative of behalf.'

This matter is one of the first importance for an editor of Aeschylus. 'Much of the originality,' says Mr. H., 'is now displayed in championing long-exploded readings.' It requires no logician to perceive the *petitio principii* in this remark. To the philologist it betrays a pernicious misconception of editorial duty. What final court of appeal has declared the readings in question to be 'long-exploded'? And is it not the first concern of any editor out of his nonage to exhaust every endeavour to discover whether a MS. reading may not perchance be right after all, before he turns aside to dally in the primrose path of

'emendation'? Mr. Headlam quotes for example *Cho.* 14

ἡ πατρὶ τῷμῳ τάσδ' ἐπείκασας τύχῳ
χοῦς φερούσας νεπτέροις μελίγμασιν;

He sagely informs us that μελίγμασιν was 'corrected by Casaubon to μελίγματα'—and that settles it! Are we then to accept any alteration proposed by Casaubon (or, at least, any which Mr. Headlam endorses)? The 'correction' is so obvious in itself that Casaubon, or a dozen other people, might have made it in less than a minute's reading of the passage. Meanwhile the MS., imperturbable as the Sphinx, offers us νεπτέροις μελίγμασιν. The question is not 'Is μελίγματα an easy reading, the substitution of which will enable us to proceed on our way to other places in which we may similarly elude a *crux*?' It is 'What does νεπτέροις μελίγμασιν mean?' Mr. Headlam virtually says it means nothing. On my side I maintain that the fault lies in his own apprehension. My note on the passage need not be repeated here. What I have a right to complain of is that, while my note does offer what I believe to be a true interpretation, supported by argument and illustration, Mr. Headlam writes upon that note an obiter dictum which contains no demonstration and adds nothing to the resources of scholarship.

Mr. Headlam seems incapable of understanding that there is a class of students who, having passed through the stage at which subjective impressions based on inadequate observation are valued more highly than documentary evidence, recognise that their first duty is to search for an explanation of the text. To them emendation is only a necessary evil, not the *raison d'être* of classical study. It is a fascinating pursuit, but it does not possess the innocence of, say, acrostic-solving. As Mr. Headlam has referred to my edition of the *Supplices* I am ready to confess that it is the representative in my case of the stage still favoured by Mr. Headlam. To me it must, I suppose, once have seemed little to alter a κράτος into a τάχος and the like. Yet despite this defect, which I regret to the full, will Mr. Headlam, point to any recent edition of a Greek play from which more conjectures have been adopted or commended by various scholars, including himself? It is with great reluctance that I am compelled to play the egoist with this question, but self-defence unfortunately renders it necessary.

I should be glad if I could stop here. Unhappily there is an unpleasant feature of the 'review' which I cannot pass over in silence. The temper in which Mr. Headlam has approached my work is, I submit, singularly unjudicial. What reasons there may be for this attitude I can hardly divine, except from such glimpses as are afforded in *C.R.* p. 349, first column. This temper renders it impossible for him to make a fair, much less a generous, statement, or even to quote correctly. Let me illustrate.

(1) In my preface I pay to Dr. Verrall the tribute which courtesy and conscientiousness demanded. I go on to say that 'in several passages' I have found that he has anticipated me in what I imagined to be a new interpretation. I can readily understand that such a tribute is disagreeable to the writer of a certain pamphlet 'on editing Aeschylus.' But when Mr. Headlam says that I 'avow having found myself habitually (*sic*) in agreement with Dr. Verrall,' he is drawing upon that imagination which so often plays him false. I fancy no one will be more surprised than Dr. Verrall to learn that I 'habitually' agree with his views. I do, however, habitually respect them.

(2) Mr. Headlam is kind enough to dole out reluctant praise to my translation. No less should be expected from a writer who has made such free use of my renderings of the *Supplices*. But in the middle of his frigid commendation he speaks airily of my renderings as being 'often incorrect.' If this means that my renderings are 'often' actually untenable as renderings of the particular Greek text which I have adopted, I maintain that a jury of the Greek professors of Great Britain would declare the assertion to be—well, let us say unsportsmanlike. My credit for accurate scholarship is hardly to be wrecked by such a puerility.

(3) Mr. Headlam labours to convey to those who have not read my book a notion that it contains nothing exegetical beyond that which has been 'collected by Blomfield, Paley, &c.' I trust no reviewer will behave in this way to Mr. Headlam when that gentleman finds the energy and courage to publish a complete edition of some classical work. As a fact, my book contains a very large number of new interpretations, studiously illustrated by quotations bearing upon both grammar and matter. Other reviewers have recognised the evident truth that I had read all classical Greek literature for the purpose of understanding and illustrating the *Choephori*. Unfortunately I had

forgotten a paper in the *Journal of Philology*.

(4) I mentioned in my preface that Mr. Headlam's contribution to the *Classical Review* appeared too late for me to make use of it. It is part of the comity of scholarship for such a statement to be accepted without question. But, jibes Mr. H. 'my last paper in the *Classical Review* was not available much more than a year before he dates his preface.' If Mr. Headlam knew more of the progress of a large work through the press, especially when printed in England for a writer in Australia, he would recognise the paltriness of the jibe. A preface is usually written when the rest of the book is in print. It hardly seemed worth while to recall the costly complete sheets for the sake of proving the undesirability of a number of Mr. Headlam's suggestions.

(5) On *Σκυθικὰ βέλη* (160), in observing that the bow was the characteristic weapon of the Scythians, I remark, 'and the Scythian police (*τοξόται*) had been established at Athens from B.C. 480.' The purpose of these words was merely to remind the reader that the Athenian audience had been for twenty-two years accustomed to the sight of the 'Scythian weapon,' and would, therefore, at once understand that *τόξα* were meant, so that the addition of *παλάντονα* 'is not required simply for further identification.' On this Mr. Headlam must observe 'But would Aeschylus make his chorus call for the police?' I leave it to any scholar to assess the value of this exquisite stroke of humour. To me it simply indicates that in writing for Mr. Headlam one must take no contributory apprehension for granted.

(6) In 542 Mr. Headlam is pleased to state that I 'disregard' the scholion *ἐπιμελείας ἡξιοῦντο*. For sufficient answer to this egregious assertion I refer the reader to my note on the passage. It will probably disgust my critic to learn that I actually once suggested to a class—for the same reasons as his—that the scholion might represent *ἐκομίζετο*. But I am thankful to say that I have made sufficient advance in palaeographical study to refuse to admit that *ἐκομίζετο* looks sufficiently like the *πλείζετο* of M. So obvious was the dissimilarity to me, and so obvious did I suppose it would be to anybody, that I did not even think this crude 'first offer and conceit of the mind' worthy of record in my notes. Here again the humour of Mr. Headlam breaks out in the remark that *σπάργαν' ἡμφοπλίζετο* suggests the picture of an 'embolstered

Tweedledee.' I do not rightly understand 'embolstered,' and can only imagine that he labours under some *a priori* error as to the word ὀπλίζω. ὀπλίζετο is, of course, due to a far greater scholar than myself, namely Victorius. If the protection afforded to the Greek baby by the process implied is not pleasing to Mr. Headlam I am afraid it is too late for him to rectify matters. In default he might look at the illustration in Dict. Ant. vol. I. 1005 b.

(7) On φιλίοις *οἷμασι δνοφερᾶς καλύπτρας (805), with which cf. Ag. 525, we have more humour. 'The image apparently being such a smile as parts the face of Sir John Tenniel's Cheshire Cat.' To analyse delicate humour is to destroy its fine bloom. I may therefore quietly ask any unprejudiced reader whether an opening in a veil (or door) which brings, or is accompanied by, joy can or cannot be normally expressed in Greek poetry by φαῖδρον οἶγμα καλύπτρας (or πυλῶν). Mr. Headlam will find endless work for his Procrustean bed if he is disposed to handle the Greek language as he has done here or at v. 469. He there declares that οὐ δόμασιν ἔμμοτον τῶνδ' ἐκάς cannot mean 'except this way the house can find no staunching of its wound.' 'That,' he announces with characteristic absoluteness 'would be οὐ τῶνδ' ἀτερ ἔμμοτον δόμασιν.' Even if this astounding assertion contained a germ of truth, it might be pointed out to Mr. Headlam that his order should mean 'not apart from *this* way has the house a cure.'

(8) On v. 882 he invites me to 'try to strike anyone's head off with a razor.' I do not find anything in the text about cutting off a head. I really cannot agree to alter the text of M to a conjecture of Abresch because Mr. Headlam misconstrues.

(9) On v. 1038 'let every Argive in time to come e'en bear me witness that I wrought it not ruthlessly,' he asks, 'Is not that rather in the style of Mr. Gilbert?' I think not, when English words are properly understood. 'Ruthless' means 'without pity.' A man who slays his mother at the bidding

of an oracle may still feel pity in the act, and Orestes desires to make that point. My conjecture μὴ νηλεῶς (for μενέλεως) may, of course, be wrong, but it is certainly not disproved by a forensic observation of Cicero. Aeschylus had not studied the moral or dramatic law under Cicero. In any case μὴ νηλεῶς may claim some resemblance to μενέλεως. Contrast this with ἐνπᾶς ὥς (687) 'corrected' by M. Schmidt, with the approval of Mr. Headlam, into νηλεῶς. If this is emendation, then any substitution is emendation.

It would require too much space in the *Classical Review* to deal with all the cases in which Mr. Headlam misrepresents or dogmatizes. More than once he remarks, explicitly or in effect, that 'we have only his (*i.e.* my) word for it.' Yet no one can read his review without finding statement after statement made which amounts simply to flat contradiction. I repeat that this is not reviewing. As a contribution to scholarship it is unconvincing.

I deeply regret being compelled to write in this way of a scholar from whom I had expected to welcome some *magnum opus* at an early date. But I believe it will be conceded that I have no alternative but to speak plainly when so vigorous an attempt is made to discredit those contributions of mine to the study of Aeschylus, concerning which I entertain no very exalted opinion, but concerning which my conscience as a 'well-intending' worker is entirely at ease.

T. G. TUCKER.

P.S.—On re-perusing the above I find a slight error in the statement that Mr. Headlam nowhere actually proves an assertion. He does prove that the verses numbered 956, 957 do not metrically correspond respectively to vv. 967 *sq.* Yet any one else would have perceived that ἰδῶν at the beginning of 968 is simply misprinted there instead of at the end of 967.

ROBERTS' DEMETRIUS DE ELOCUTIONE.

Reply to Dr. Rutherford.

IN a review—not too severe if sound, but, as I contend, radically unsound—criticizing in the current number of this Journal my recent edition of *Demetrius de Elocutione*, Dr. Rutherford suggests haste and hurry as

an excuse for some of my alleged shortcomings. Instead of troubling my readers with an autobiographical account of my literary life, which would prove that I am unable to avail myself of this plea, I

propose to show that the scholar who needs it is not I but my critic.

I shall begin by expressing some surprise that, in the review, no description is given of the general plan, scope, and contents of my edition. No mention is made of the fact that the Introduction includes a historical sketch (however slight) of the study of Prose Style among the Greeks; a summary and appreciation of the *De Elocutione*; and a discussion of the evidence (internal and external) with regard to the Date and Authorship of the treatise.¹ Not one word is said about the Bibliography, though the endeavour to reach and read the various writings included in it has been not slight; nor is any reference made to the many modern illustrations incorporated in the work. Nor yet is any notice taken of the fact that this is the first English critical text, and the first English translation, of Demetrius; and that, for this edition as for Dionysius' *Second Letter to Ammaeus*, the Paris MS. 1741 has been carefully collated. For the print, indeed, and the facsimiles there is a word of commendation; and it is commendation well won. But that is all. Are these omissions, on the part of the reviewer, the outcome of haste, or what is their origin?

Dr. Rutherford has chosen, then, to devote himself almost entirely to criticism of the Translation and the Glossary: ground on which I am quite ready to meet him. But it is necessary to premise that, for sheer lack of time and space, I must confine myself (with little more than one exception) to the first page of his review, and in that to specimen blunders only. I therefore pass lightly over the reviewer's confusion (in a passage where accurate language is of consequence) of Dionysius and Demetrius on the second page of his review; nor do I dwell on the bustling haste, quickening often into a scamper, which causes him to give some wonderful Greek of his own in the second column of the last-page-but-one.² I have no wish to waste time on comparative trifles, but desire rather to meet him on the ground where he evidently feels strongest.

¹ In the matter of Date and Authorship (as indeed in many other matters) the most recent German editor Radermacher and I have independently reached very similar conclusions: based, for the most part, on a study of the language and the grammar of the treatise. It may be well to add that, when I undertook the publication of the *De Elocutione*, I had not heard that a critical edition, on modern lines, was elsewhere in preparation.

² From this point onward it will be understood that the words in italics are those used by Dr. Rutherford himself when reviewing *Demetrius on Style*.

There is, then, one point (not on the first page) that I shall dwell on because Dr. Rutherford thinks it a conclusive one against me: the true meaning of the word *γλαφυρός*. Let it be admitted at once that he is right in attaching the utmost importance to a correct rendering of this term. It is one of the most vital words in the whole treatise; and if I have misrepresented its meaning, I deserve all the censure which can be conveyed by his most ample vocabulary of depreciation, on which, being now confessedly in a hurry, I shall continue to draw occasionally. His own equivalent for *ὁ γλαφυρὸς λόγος* is 'the light style,' and he says:—

'Perhaps no part of the translation is quite so bewildering as that relating to the 'light style' (*ὁ γλαφυρὸς λόγος*).... Following tradition, he renders the cardinal term *γλαφυρός* by 'smooth,' and then all the subordinate terminology goes wrong. There is one passage from which he might have learned for certain that 'smooth' does not render *γλαφυρός*, at least in Demetrius, namely, § 183; but this contains technical terms unfamiliar to him, and is so rendered that it does not represent in any sense what Demetrius says.'

Now will it be credited that not once in the entire translation (not even in § 183, to which the reviewer refers specifically), nor once in the Summary (pp. 28-34 of my edition), is *γλαφυρός* translated 'smooth'? The rendering 'elegant' is given consistently throughout, the words 'smooth' and 'smoothness' being as consistently reserved for *λεῖος* and *λεωτός*: cp. § 178, where *τῶν δὲ εἰρημένων ὀνομάτων τὰ λεῖα μόνον ληπτέον ὡς γλαφυρόν τι ἔχοντα* is rendered, 'Of all the words indicated, the smooth alone must be employed as possessing any elegance.' As far as I remember, the word 'smooth' is only once used in connexion with *γλαφυρός*, namely in the Glossary (p. 272), where the entry runs: '*γλαφυρός*, §§ 36, 127, 128, 138, 178, 179, 183, 184, 186. *Smooth, polished, elegant*: *χαρακτήρ γλαφυρός* being one of the four types of style. Lat. *politus, floridus, ornatus, elegans*. French, *élegant, orné*.' The Glossary is intended to supplement the Translation; and anyone who had read the Translation might be expected to remember (refreshing, if necessary, his memory by consulting the references) that 'elegant' had been deliberately preferred in it, and that the adjective 'smooth' is mainly (though not entirely) introduced in order to show how the sense 'polished' or 'elegant' arose from the early Homeric meaning. For the meaning 'light' I can find no support in etymology, nor yet in the actual usage of the *De Elocutione*. Take § 138 for

example: 'The conveyance of two ideas in one sentence often gives a graceful effect (τὸ χάριεν). A writer once said of a sleeping Amazon: "Her bow lay strung, her quiver full, her buckler by her head; their girdles they never loose." At one and the same time the custom concerning the girdle is indicated and its observance in the present case,—the two facts by means of one expression. And from this conciseness a certain elegance (γλαφυρόν τι) results.' Dr. Rutherford, would, I suppose, substitute 'a certain lightness' for 'a certain elegance.' But where is the 'lightness'? I see none, though I see considerable neatness.¹ My censor may reply that, though he favours the adjective, he would not necessarily favour the noun. But no one knows better than Dr. Rutherford that one of the first duties and most difficult problems for the translator is to find, if he can, an adjective which has a corresponding noun, adverb, and (if possible) verb as well. Let us, however, carry our inquiries a little further.

When in a witty passage (too long to quote fully) Longinus (*de Subl.* x. 6) says: πλὴν μικρὸν αὐτὸ καὶ γλαφυρὸν ἐποίησεν ἀντὶ φοβερῶς, he means 'Aratus has replaced the awe-inspiring poetry of Homer by a petty elegance,' not 'a petty lightness.' If these words of Longinus are compared with those which precede them, it will be seen that ἀνθος corresponds closely to τὸ γλαφυρόν. That γλαφυρός and ἀνθηρός are practically synonymous appears also from Dionys. Hal. *de Comp. Verb.* c. 21 (τὴν μὲν αὐστηράν, τὴν δὲ γλαφυράν ἢ ἀνθηράν, τὴν δὲ τρίτην κοινήν), and c. 23 (ἡ δὲ γλαφυρά καὶ ἀνθηρά σύνθεσις: the two adjectives in this last passage are translated respectively by 'smooth' and 'florid' in Jebb's *Attic Orators* ii. 56, while in vol. i. p. 161 of the same work 'polished type' is given as an equivalent of Demetrius' χαρακτήρ γλαφυρός). Looking back on this brief investigation we are, I fear, forced to the conclusion that the reviewer is likely to prove an untrustworthy guide to rhetorical doctrine expressed in terms of art, if he deliberately mistranslates a term which he himself justly describes as cardinal. I fear we must confess that he misrepresents the doctrine of Demetrius to a serious degree. If next we desire to moralise, it will be in some such words as these: *it takes time and patience to ponder and brood over technical*

terms, and to find, if one can, simple English equivalents for them. If, in our charity, we try to find an excuse for the offender, we shall speak of a *misapprehension, due itself also to haste, of the technical terms, which in a τέχνη cannot well be avoided, and in any version of a τέχνη should be rendered with the most minute and deliberate exactness.* No one who has followed this demonstration of the reviewer's incompetence (or haste) in a cardinal instance chosen by himself will need my assurance, with reference to subordinate terminology, that it would make a long list were I to register by the page and line the cases in which he seems to me to have perverted the signification of technical terms.²

The observant reader will have remarked how careful I have been, in the course of the above argument, to quote no Roman author but only late, and probably not far from contemporaneous, Greek critics. And why so? Because Dr. Rutherford has somehow got it into his head that I am a 'Romanist,' a 'convinced Romanist'; and I want to prove to him that I am as good a Protestant as he is any day. Only, I am not blind to one great danger to which extreme forms of the Protestant religion are exposed: the danger that each man should constitute himself his own Pope. I have, indeed, heard of men, happy men, in modern times, who can think in Greek, and to whom a mere translation must seem a mockery. And if any such man there really be, I should think him well entitled to be his own Greek Pope and to command the homage of the faithful. But till I find him, I shall prefer to put my faith in Cicero. Not that I shall think Cicero infallible: my Protestant instincts will save me from that. But I shall not forget that he was a man of genius and an orator, that he learnt Greek rhetoric from the lips of Greek teachers, that he took extraordinary pains to find the best Latin equivalents for the technical terms used by the Greek rhetoricians; and I shall prefer the 'hit-or-miss' renderings of Tully to the veritable meaning of the technical terms employed by the Greeks, if the 'verit-

² There is in the reviewer's language as above quoted a small inaccuracy, unnoticed so far, to which I shall only refer as a mote moving on the surface and showing how the current goes. He speaks (perhaps because in his haste he has confined his turn for search to § 128) as though λόγος were Demetrius' regular term for 'style.' The truth is that here Demetrius is using not technical but popular language, his technical term for 'style,' in the sense here meant, being χαρακτήρ. A small point, I repeat; but such small points create, in the long run, an odd sense of mystification and of insecurity.

¹ As soon should I imagine that when Plutarch, in his *Life of Marius* c. 3, mentions ἀστεῖον καὶ γλαφυρὸν βίον, he has in mind the 'light' life of the town. But really, what 'lightness' is in style I scarcely know.

able meaning' be that pontifically expounded by Dr. Rutherford.

But it is time to return to the selected first page. Take the following criticism:—

'It were possible, no doubt, to find Greek terms which ought to be translated, "like as a horse untethered bounds proudly prancing over the plain"; but the line (sic) from Xenophon (§ 89) does not furnish them, but common words that should be Englished: "like a horse unbridled bounding freshly across the field and kicking up his heels."'

Let us give the Greek of § 89 as a whole (since the reviewer quotes none of it, being—for a Hellenist—rather sparing of the Greek in all his criticisms): ἐπὶ μὲν τοὶ εἰκασίαν ποιοῦμεν τὴν μεταφορὰν, ὡς προλέλεκται, στοχαστέον τοῦ συντόμου, καὶ τοῦ μηδὲν πλέον τοῦ ὥσπερ προτιθέναι, ἐπεὶ τοὶ ἀντ' εἰκασίας παραβολὴ ἔσται ποιητικὴ, οἷον τὸ τοῦ Ξενοφώντος, ὥσπερ δὲ κύνων γενναῖος ἀπροσῆτως ἐπὶ κάπρον φέρεται, καὶ ὥσπερ ἵππος λυθεὶς διὰ πέδιον γαυριῶν καὶ ἀπολακτίζων. ταῦτα γὰρ οὐκ εἰκασίαις ἐστὶ εἰκερ, ἀλλὰ παραβολαῖς ποιηταῖς. The gist of this passage is that, in prose, poetical imagery must be avoided; plain metaphor and plain simile may be employed, but nothing more. Now in the example dealt with by Dr. Rutherford there is 'color poetici' not merely in the image but in the actual language, and the words in my English version were carefully chosen so as to suggest that most undesirable thing, poetical prose. In the reviewer's own better mind there may lurk some dim consciousness of this when he speaks of Xenophon's 'line'. But the passage does not, seemingly, come from any of Xenophon's extant works. Here the reviewer, in his haste, has been led astray by the misplacement of one numeral, and the loss of another, in my edition. As he would have seen, had he been at the trouble to turn the reference up, the words are not taken from the *Cyropaedia*, but should have been marked (after my usual practice) by *Ser. Inc.*¹ Nevertheless it is in a work attributed to Xenophon that the best parallel to the passage may be sought: ἦν δὲ τις οὕτως ἀνεζωπυρημένῳ αὐτῷ δῶ τὸν χαλινόν,

¹ It would have been a real service to scholarship had Dr. Rutherford helped in tracing to their source the too numerous illustrations unassigned in my edition. Some of these are probably invented examples, but there are no doubt others which could be found somewhere in extant Greek literature if only we were to carry our search far enough. Again, it would have been a useful thing had he made some remarks on the connexion of Demetrius *de Elocutione* with Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Theophrastus' treatise *On Style*. I have said something on this subject in my edition, but by no means all.

ἐνταῦθα ὑφ' ἡδονῆς τῷ διὰ τὴν χαλαρότητα τοῦ στομίον λελύσθαι νομίζειν, κυδρῷ μὲν τῷ σχήματι, ὑγροῖν δὲ τοῖν σκελοῖν γαυριόμενος φέρεται, παντάπασιν ἐκμιμούμενος τὸν πρὸς ἵππους καλλωπισμὸν (*R. Eq.* 10, 16). It is to me incomprehensible how the editor of *Babrius* and *Herondas* (of which latter the 'complete edition', promised long ago, still lingers), and above all the author of the *New Phrynichus*, can have so utterly failed to seize the point of Demetrius' criticism in § 89. 'Common words', yes; but common only in the 'Common Dialect' and in poetry, not in the best Attic prose. If anyone doubts this, let him consult Dr. Rutherford's *New Phrynichus* and other books; let him think of *πέδιον*, with its suggestion of a score of Homeric similes; let him even take *ἀπολακτίζων*, which on the surface looks the essence of colloquialism, and note that it is never used by Aristophanes (who, in my opinion, would never have used it except in parody of Aeschylus) and that *ἐκλακτίζων* would be the appropriate word in Attic prose. Shall I speak my mind in perfect frankness to the reviewer and tell him one chief cause of his shortcomings—grave shortcomings as they appear to me? It is his want of true literary sense: a want conspicuously illustrated, in the general judgment of scholars, by his magisterial method of criticism as exhibited in the castigation of Thucydides.

It has puzzled me why, on the same first page of the review, exception should be taken to the conception of the Notes as notes—as a means of stating doubts, suggesting alternatives, removing difficulties, and generally supplementing the Translation. Metaphrase can hardly be made to do duty for paraphrase. This point has been well made, in a recent number of the *Revue de l'Instruction Publique en Belgique* by Monsieur Ch. Michel, Professor of Greek in the University of Liège: 'celle-ci (la traduction) forme ce premier commentaire qui ne devrait jamais manquer dans les éditions de traités techniques et dont se dispensent si facilement les philologues.'² This conception of the translation as the first line of commentary is surely the right one. It is the first line: that and no more. But the first line should never be wanting. How far there is, in my edition, due co-operation

² If my memory serves me (I have not the volume within reach where I write) a similar view was not long ago expressed, in a notice (in the *Revue de Philologie*) of my *Longinus* and *Dionysius* by the distinguished scholar M. Albert Martin, author of 'Les scolies du manuscrit d'Aristophane à Ravenne: Étude et collation,' published in 1882.

(so to say) between Translation, Notes, and Glossary, it is for others to judge; but I could wish nothing better than that each reader of Dr. Rutherford's review should read the book for himself, in order to test personally the validity not only of the criticism now under discussion but of every other. Take, for instance, p. 68, l. 21 of my edition (we are still keeping to the first page of the review): *κατακεκομμένη γὰρ ἔοικεν ἢ σύνθεσις καὶ κεκερματισμένη, καὶ εὐκαταφρόνητος διὰ τὸ μικρὰ σύμπαντα ἔχειν*. That is the reading of the Paris manuscript, on which my text is avowedly based, and whose readings I am therefore anxious to retain if possible. And so in the Notes I write: 'Schneider proposed *κατακεκομμένη* and *κεκερματισμένη*, which palaeographically would be hardly a change at all, apart from the corresponding alteration of *εὐκαταφρόνητος* which it seems to entail.' I might have added that *εὐκατε ἡδόμενοι* occurs in Xen. *Hellen.* vi. 3, 8, and is rightly retained in Mr. E. C. Marchant's recent text; though, as might be expected, Cobet (and no doubt his faithful British henchman) would 'correct' *ἡδόμενοι* to *ἡδομέvous*. And so one might go on and on. But to repeat one's edition is weary work, and I prefer (after again asking each reader to see and judge for himself) to take another line. In order that this controversy may, if possible, be not entirely barren, I shall pick (not from the first page only but from the entire review) the three cases in which the reviewer seems to have some show of reason on his side.

The first case, though it looks at first sight substantial, is really only verbal. The reviewer complains that in § 122, through an ignorant belief that *στρατηγός* can mean nothing but 'military commander,' I proceed to insert a conjectural ἢ. He exaggerates my ignorance: I have not read Polybius and Plutarch (and much earlier writers than these) to so little purpose. Nor have I failed to read § 78 of the *De Elocutione*, where I translate 'There is a resemblance, for instance, between a general, a pilot, and a charioteer; they are all in command. Accordingly it can correctly be said that a general pilots the State, and conversely that a pilot commands the ship.' Here in using 'general,' rather than 'magistrate,' to translate *στρατηγός*, it is obvious that I was not thinking solely of military command. Nor in § 122 do I give 'military commander,' but 'general' (a word which in earlier English was much less restricted than now) in my translation; and I may add that the real difficulties of the passage which lead

Radermacher to mark a lacuna, and me to insert a word, are not met in the rendering which the reviewer substitutes for my own.¹ —The second instance seems more serious. In § 258 the Greek runs: *παύσεται δ' ἂν ποτε καὶ δεινότητα, εἰ τις ὧδε εἴποι 'ἀνέτραψεν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀφροσύνης τε ἐπὶ τῆς ἀσεβείας τε τὰ ἱερὰ τε τὰ ὀσά τε*,' which I have rendered, 'Force of style will also mark a sentence of this kind: "He turned upside down, in his folly and his impiety too, things sacred and things holy too."' Here Dr. Rutherford kindly suggests that, in 'working against time,' I have overlooked the established meaning of *ἱερὰ καὶ ὀσά*. Again I would assure him that I have not read Thucydides and Demosthenes (not to mention Plato's *Republic*) without coming upon that well-known phrase and apprehending (I hope) its meaning. But the question a translator has to ask himself is: what is its meaning here? Is it here used in its Attic sense, or is it not? My own feeling was, and is, that it is not.² The part of the *De Elocutione* in which it occurs is, as I have more than once remarked in my edition, markedly inferior to the earlier part and probably contains many interpolations; this may be one of them. At all events, I find it hard to believe that any good Attic writer is the serious author of the illustration given by Demetrius; the *τε* four times used (as a sort of Homeric echo in prose) in the Greek original is even more awkward than the 'too' twice used in the English rendering. Here, where we are in a real difficulty and would like to be informed from what author the words are taken, Dr. Rutherford does not help us at all, and till he informs me to the contrary I shall take them to be late Greek and to be correctly translated as above. The sentence is a remarkably poor example

¹ For verbal points of this kind, cp. *C.R.* xvi. 386b, xvii. 79a. Professor Seymour's article illustrates the difficulty of translating not only *ταύκληρος* (which can be applied even to a 'doss-man'), but also *κυβερνήτης* (*π. ἐρμ.* § 78, where Demetrius clearly has Demosth. *de Cor.* § 194 in mind: a fact that throws light on the meaning of *στρατηγός* here and elsewhere in the *π. ἐρμ.*) The Elizabethan translators have much to teach us in these matters: cp. Sir Thomas North's 'that he had continued treasurer under his captain the space of three years,' as a rendering of a passage in Plutarch's *Life of C. Gracchus* c. 2 *ταμείων* ('acting as quaestor') δὲ τῷ *στρατηγῷ* ('praetor', or more strictly 'proconsul' here) *παρμενηκέναι τριετίαν*.

² It is noteworthy that so diligent a student of the Attic writers as Dionysius never (so far as I know) uses the phrase *ἱερὰ καὶ ὀσά* in the special Attic meaning. Instead, he uses such expressions as *ἐκ παντὸς ἱεροῦ καὶ βεβήλου τόπου* (*Antiq. Rom.* vii. 8).

of 'force,' but it is on a par with similar suggestions in §§ 256, 257, and I have myself little doubt that the writer (or interpolator) intended a kind of parallelism or proportion, ἡ ἀφροσύνη : ἡ ἀσέβεια :: τὰ ἱερά : τὰ ὅσια. It is noteworthy that Victorius (a scholar not inferior to Dr. Rutherford) explains τὰ ἱερά τε τὰ ὅσια τε as meaning 'fana et sacras alias res.'—The third instance, again, is a question of late Greek. Personally I am not much concerned to defend the reading in question, for the suggestion is not my own. But as an illustration of the reviewer's methods, let this graphic sentence be transcribed. 'But as Demetrius says:—ταῦτα μὲν δὴ παρατεχνολογίσθω (παρατεχνολογίσθω ??) ἄλλως.' The natural inferences of a reader here would be: (1) the editor has conjectured and adopted παρατεχνολογίσθω, (2) he has committed a great enormity in so doing. But, as a matter of fact, the conjecture is not adopted in my text, and the only mention of it is in the Notes (p. 242) as follows: 'if any change were to be suggested, it might be (with Goeller) that of παρατεχνολογίσθω to παρατεχνολογίσθω (cp. λελέχθω § 41).' Let it be observed that recognition of late grammatical forms and usage is denied to the reviewer, though permissible to the reviewer. Says the reviewer, in one of those remarkable suggestions he makes when he turns from the task of demolition to that of reconstruction: '§ 260 τοῦ ὀπίσθου δραμόντος: the active aorist will not translate unless in this race there were but one runner; but can Demetrius have written a form like δραμέντος?'—δραμέντος ???

Thus on reviewing my reviewer, I have been astonished at the weakness of his onslaught, and have been tempted to think that I could do better myself. Of one thing I am certain. Did I desire to find fault at all costs with any classical edition, it is on the Translation that I should undoubtedly fasten, especially if my general acquaintance with the subject was limited and I did not wish to take any great trouble. The reasons why translations (however carefully executed) must always be vulnerable are obvious; in a translation are involved such difficult points as those of taste, of ambiguities in the original, and of the inadequacy of all attempts to render those terms which were meant to be significant and informing to Greeks alone.

There is one other passage in the review to which I must briefly refer before concluding. It begins just two lines from the end of the first page (which, after all,

is only three-quarters of a page), but even if it were not on the first page at all, I am sure Dr. Rutherford would never forgive me were I to pass it over and thus deprive this dull encounter of the comic relief it so sorely needs. The paragraph of Demetrius must have tickled his own sense of humour irresistibly, though (rather selfishly, as I consider) he has kept all the fun to himself. But as the sage Ibsen somewhere says (I am, I regret, too much in a hurry to give the quotation with that precision which the reviewer demands), 'sorrow and suffering we can bear alone; it takes two to be glad.' And I feel confident that, once he realises the truth of this, Dr. Rutherford will not refuse to share his joys with others more liberally than he has done on this occasion. I quote, without further preface, from the bottom of the first page:—

'In § 160 Demetrius says: "And there is mirth too in likening one thing to another thing, the cock to a Mede because he wears his turban cocked, or to a king because a king dresses in rich colours": καὶ εἰκασίαι δ' εἰσὶν εὐχάριτες, ἂν τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα Μῆδω εἰκάσῃς, ὅτι τὴν κυρβάσιαν ὀρθὴν φέρει. βασιλεῖ δέ, ὅτι πορφύρεός ἐστιν: the editor renders, nor gives any proof that κυρβάσις is ever used for a cock's-comb. "Comparisons also are full of charm—if (for instance) you compare a cock to a Persian because of its stiff-upstanding crest, or to the Persian king because of its brilliant plumage." [It will probably be convenient to the reader that the text and translation of the remainder of this section should be added at this point (before we proceed to comment on the reviewer's criticism): ἢ ὅτι βοήσαντος ἀλεκτρυόνος ἀναπῆδωμεν, ὥσπερ καὶ βασιλέως βοήσαντος, καὶ φοβούμεθα,—'or because when the cock crows we start with fear as though we heard the loud call of the monarch.']

'The editor renders, nor gives any proof that κυρβάσις is ever used for a cock's-comb' This is a true charge: the editor is guilty of the alleged omission. He has, at all events, given no reference at the foot of the page.¹ And why? Because in his simplicity he thought that any reader—Dr. Rutherford, for example—would have made use of a solid and informing, but by no means dull and unattractive book, by one who is anything but a Romanist, Rutherford's Scholia Aristophanica, which would have saved a critical notice from some disfigurements. References are given in 'Rutherford,' which if followed up would have kept a reviewer straight, even if he had not read largely in Aristophanes. The passages (R 1, 458 ff. = Aristoph. Av.

¹ It is, perhaps, to be regretted that Dr. Rutherford was not Romanist enough to visit just for once the *locus paenitentiae*, p. 239. He would there have found the needed reference.

275 ff.) are a capital example of archaic Greek, expressing straightforward reasoning in straightforward and accurate language, and I give a translation of them below.¹

Dr. Rutherford may not be satisfied with one passage of Aristophanes (*Av.* 487), but may object that it is equivocal (as all puns have the misfortune to be: let him compare λόφος, *ib.* 279). Very well, I present another to his notice: Aristoph. *Fragm.* 465, καὶ τὴν κυνὴν ἔχειν με κυρβασίαν ἐπεῖς. I can well imagine that, in translating this passage, Dr. Rutherford will be loyal to his

¹ The cock fu' stately strides wi' genty tread,
An' wears his bonnet straught upon his head:
[The cock's a vera Shah!
His philabeg an' tartan plaid sae gay
Shame e'en the rainbow hues on simmer's day:
[The cock's a vera Shah!
His pibroch loud, when heard in mirkest night,
Gars lazy louns start frae their beds wi' fright:
[The cock's a vera Shah!

I wish I knew my Burns better, but I have done the best I could—in a hurry. It is well known among Hellenists (as distinguished from mere 'Romanists') that the genuine works of Aristophanes, like those of Menander, have long since perished from the world. In the reconstructed Greek which underlies my verse translation, I have ventured to assume that expressions such as διαβάσκει, ἀβροβάτης and ὀρθίος νόμος, gleaned or inferred from Rutherford's invaluable (the praise awarded above is altogether too grudging) *Scholía Aristophanica*, are part of the original passage. May I take this opportunity of announcing that I have long had in preparation a work entitled *Aristophanes e Scholiis Aristophanicis Rutherfordianis Restitutus*: a work which, when it appears, will be no hurried production but the ripe fruit of my leisure and not unworthy (I trust) of the source from which it draws its inspiration?

It will be noticed that (in order to humour the reviewer, who has a pronounced aversion to the 'cock's-comb') I have translated τὴν κυρβασίαν (which should be 'bonnet-crest') by 'bonnet' merely. I am afraid I cannot help him any further, though, in the rather awkward dilemma in which he finds himself placed. Either (1) he has forgotten his Aristophanes, or (2) he has missed his jests; and one really does not know which is the less formidable alternative. The methods of cure are, however, fortunately obvious. In case (1), the natural remedy is not to pin one's faith to Liddell and Scott (who are here most misleading), and not to allow the brisk and humorous lecturer Demetrius (who here enjoys his joke so much that he is more than usually elliptical and never pauses to explain that he means the Persian king throughout—not an ordinary Persian, nor an ordinary king) to prove altogether too brisk and altogether too humorous for his casual reader and so be changed into a clumsy and somewhat prosy writer treating of things which he does not wholly comprehend. In case (2), I have no title to prescribe. But I cannot help thinking that, when Dr. Rutherford has found a remedy, he will then modify in some way the following translation in his *Scholía Aristophanica* I. p. 459, 'κοκκύσει γὰρ κυρίως ὅταν παρ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ νίκην τῆς μάχης ᾄσῃ: "κοκκύσειν being properly applied to the noise made by the bird for his own satisfaction after a victory in the cock-pit."

turban and (with Blaydes) will say 'and the cap that I am wearing you will take for a turban.' But where's the point in that? And if I suggest that there is a punning reference to the dog and the cock and that a better English rendering would be 'and you'll call my beaver my cockade,' or something of that kind, he will tell me that I am ignorant of my Homer, let alone my Demetrius. (By the way, Burns's 'Cock up your beaver, and cock it fu' sprush,' or his own 'cocked turban' might have kept him straight, though I do not suggest that there is any actual pun in these expressions). Even in Homer's time, he will remind me, κυνὴ had become a mere conventional term for 'cap,' so that the aged Laertes is wearing αἰγίων κυνέην when his gallant son finds him in the vineyard. This is true. But may not the inveterate punster, a true lover of the past though less reverent than his brother-poets of epic and of tragedy, laugh into life again the dead meanings of words? Is not this, this also, part of the Greek nimbleness of mind?

But though Dr. Rutherford will have none of Aristophanes, he may yet hearken to a later Greek, Hesychius (who writes 'κυρβασία· ὀρθὴ τιάρα. ταύτῃ δὲ οἱ Περσῶν βασιλεῖς μόνοι ἐχρῶντο. καὶ κορυφὴ ἀλέκτορος'); or (passing by other evidence of a similar kind) to the Greek dictionary instituted by a still later Hellenist Stephanus ('κυρβασία, ἡ, Hesychio κορυφὴ ἀλέκτορος, crista gallinae; item ὀρθὴ τιάρα, Tiara erecta, qua Persarum reges soli utebantur'). And if he will have none of these, then we must just leave him to himself with his turban cocked.

But no. Never shall he in this merry war be compared to vainglorious chanticleer, not even in that happy hour when the royal bird 'makes a noise for his own satisfaction after a victory in the cock-pit.' Rather, remembering alike his present plight and the undoubted services which in the past he has done to Greek scholarship, we shall employ a nobler and yet a sadder image and shall liken him to the 'struck eagle':—

'Twas thine own genius gave the final blow,
And help'd to plant the wound that laid thee low:

So the struck eagle, stretch'd upon the plain,
No more through rolling clouds to soar again,
Viewed his own feather on the fatal dart,
And wing'd the shaft that quiver'd in his heart.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES,
BANGOR.

February 17th, 1903.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN ROME.

(See *C.R.* 1902, P. 284.)

DURING the past summer and autumn no discoveries of first-rate importance have been made in the Forum.

The fall of the campanile of St. Mark's forced upon the authorities the necessity of taking measures to investigate the stability of other buildings of Venice, and it was also incumbent upon them to examine the foundations of the campanile itself as an indispensable preliminary to its reconstruction. In connexion with this work Comm. Boni was summoned to Venice, and has devoted to it much time and attention. The result is, that, though work in the Forum has by no means been suspended, it has not been carried on upon so large a scale as has sometimes been the case. Further, it so happens that the parts of the site now under examination have not produced anything of paramount interest since the date of my last report. As Dr. Vaglieri says (*Bull. Com.* 1902, 186), owing to Comm. Boni's absence a great deal of time has been spent in the shifting of large masses of earth as a preparation for more detailed investigations.

On the other hand, the literature of the present excavations has been enriched by the first general summary of the results that has yet appeared. I allude to Prof. Hülsen's article (*Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Forum Romanum 1898-1902*) published in the *Römische Mitteilungen*, 1902, pp. 1-97, and also separately. As a description of the state of the excavations, and a discussion and critical bibliography of the various works that have appeared on the subject, it is quite unsurpassed: it is well illustrated with plans and photographs, and any one who wishes to form a clear idea of what has been done in the Forum since 1898 could have no better or sounder guide. Prof. Hülsen has also dealt with the epigraphic results of the excavations in C. F. Lehmann's *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, Bd. 2 (1902) pp. 227-283.

In the first of these two articles there are a few points which may well be touched upon. First among these is the almost certainly correct identification (p. 12) of the schola Xantha (the office of the subordinates—*scribae librarii* and *praecones*—of the curule aediles) with a small, almost rectangular, building, of which only the white marble pavement is preserved, situated between the

Arch of Tiberius and the south-west end of the (so-called) Graecostasis of the late Republic (for which see *C.R.* 1901, p. 330 n. 2).

The epistyle of the schola Xantha itself was found in or near this very spot in the sixteenth century,¹ (*C.I.L.* vi. 103, Hülsen, *Röm. Mitt.* 1888, 208). With regard to the date of the so-called tomb of Romulus and the group of monuments adjacent to it, including the inscribed stele, Prof. Hülsen (pp. 29, 30) attributes (conjecturally) the tomb to the fifth century, considering the stele to be earlier rather than later in date. The destruction of the whole group he ascribes, probably with truth, to the reconstruction of the Forum and its buildings by Caesar and Augustus.

The comparatively good preservation of the monuments (remembering, as we must, that they had been above ground for at least four centuries before their partial destruction) and the extraordinary freshness of the lettering of the inscriptions on the stele seem to require explanation, when we consider the friable nature of the tufa of which they are composed. We may of course suppose that they were protected by a roof from the weather—to conjecture that what we now have before us may be restorations of the second or third century B.C. (following closely, however, the older forms) would be dangerous.

Prof. Hülsen re-echoes the often expressed wish (p. 52) for the removal and examination of the heap of fragments at the south corner of the Basilica Aemilia, of which the most important are those of the great inscription in honour of Lucius Caesar (*C.R.*, 1899, p. 465). It may be noted that the inscription itself is suffering from exposure to the weather.

An important theory is that (pp. 74-81) as to the original destination of the building behind the temple of Augustus, which was later on occupied by the church of S. Maria Antiqua, and which, with the temple, forms a single group of buildings, dating, as the brickstamps show, from the time of Domitian. Now we know (1) that the temple of Augustus was restored by Domitian (Richter, *Topogr.*² 151), (2) that soldiers' discharge certificates ('*tabulae honestae misionis*') were, since about 89 A.D., copied

¹ Marliani (*Topogr.* Bk. II. ch. x., p. 29, ed. 1543) gives the find-spot as 'sub Concordiae templo (by which he means that of Saturn) in capite fori.'

from originals preserved at Rome 'in muro post templum Divi Augusti ad Minervam,' (3) that the *Curiosum* (Richter, p. 373) mentions templum Castorum (not Caesaris, as Hülsen says on p. 80) et Minervae (the latter, according to the chronographic of 354 A.D. erected by Domitian), (4) that there was a library connected with the temple of Augustus, of which Minerva would be the natural protector. Prof. Hülsen is, therefore, inclined to suppose that the eastern of the two halls behind the temple contained the military archives and the shrine of Minerva, while the western was the library.

He also (p. 95) attributes the fragment of a curved epistyle of white marble (*C.R.* 1899, p. 467) bearing the letters '... toninus/... imp. ii/... estituit,' and on the right of the inscription, a Maenad in relief, to a temple of Bacchus of which Martial speaks thus (i. 70, 9 is the correct citation) 'flecte vias hac qua madidi sunt tecta Lyaei et Cybeles picto stat Corybante torus' (v. l. tholus). A coin of Antoninus Pius (to whom the inscription probably belongs) gives a representation of a round temple containing a statue of Bacchus (Cohen, ii, p. 396 n. 1187). If the attribution is correct, then 'sacer clivus,' in l. 5 of the passage of Martial, would after all refer to the ascent from the Forum to the 'Summa Velia' (*C.R.* 1902, pp. 96, 286).

Prof. Hülsen refuses to believe (p. 94) that the building on the north-east side of the Sacra Via between the temple of Antoninus and Faustina and the temple of Romulus (see *C.R.* 1902, p. 286) is a prison, and prefers to call it a series of treasure chambers for the jewellers and sellers of precious stones who had shops in the Sacra Via. Dr. Vaglieri's attempt (*Bull. Com.* 1902, pp. 31-34) to demonstrate that this edifice is the *Carcer Lautumiarum* (Liv. xxxii. 26) is open to grave objections, the chief of which is, that he transfers the *Lautumiae* from the north-east side of the Capitol to almost the lowest point of the valley of the Forum, where there is apparently (see the section in *Not. Scav.* 1902 p. 99) no rock at all, but rather a sedimentary deposit of tufa washed down from the higher ground (*ibid.* p. 101).

Short summaries of the more recent results are given by Dr. Vaglieri in the *Bullettino Comunale* (1902, pp. 25-36, 186-191): and in the same periodical appears also Prof. Lanciani's article on the altar of Vulcan (pp. 125-133) in which he justifies in *extenso* his view that it is to be identified with a roughly squared mass of rock in

front of the steps of the temple of Concord (see *C.R.* 1902, p. 94).

The official reports, on the other hand, after having at first kept pace with the progress of the excavations, have of late fallen somewhat behind: since the long report on the shrine of Juturna in the *Notizie degli Scavi* for Feb. 1901 (pp. 41-144), only two short papers on the Forum have appeared in this, the official publication—one by Prof. Marucchi on a Christian sarcophagus (1901, pp. 272-278), and the other by Comm. Boni on the recently discovered prehistoric necropolis (1902, pp. 96-111: cf. Dr. Pinza in *Bull. Com.* 1902, pp. 37-55, and pp. 186-189; in the last passage Dr. Vaglieri describes four other tombs which have been lately discovered, the bodies in some cases having been buried, in others cremated). It is to be hoped that, notwithstanding the complexity of the subject, it will be possible to continue the regular publication of these reports. With regard to the excavations themselves, though, as has been said, discoveries of first-rate importance have not occurred, the investigation of the prehistoric necropolis still continues, the Arch of Severus is receiving much needed repairs, and great progress has been made with the important task of connecting the Forum with the Palatine.

The road ascending from the Arch of Titus to the Palatine has been followed further, and some remains of buildings belonging to a date previous to the construction of the Domus Gaiana have been discovered. The reconstruction of the series of inclined planes which ascend from S. Maria Antiqua to the Palatine is complete: and excavations are still proceeding on the S. W. side of the temple of Augustus, where the depth of earth to be removed is very considerable, and, so far, hardly anything has been discovered except remains of 'tabernae' built against the S. W. wall of the temple, and some further remains of an already known private house on the N. W. slope of the Palatine. Facing both of these there is a brick wall from which project buttresses connected by arches, which seems to be represented in the Forma Urbis (Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, Fig. 47), though what we now have before us looks like a reconstruction of later date than the time of Septimius Severus.

On the Palatine itself the house that stood between the N. E. end of the so-called Stadium and the church of S. Bona-

ventura has been removed, and the scanty remains laid bare of a building which Hülsen (*Forma Urbis Romae Antiquae*, Pl. III.) calls 'Bibliotheca.' Beneath this building are large subterranean water tanks, (cf. Venuti, *Roma Antica* (ed. iii) Vol. i. p. 38) in which was stored the water brought by the branch of the Aqua Claudia which passes over the Caelian and then crosses the valley which separates it from the Palatine.

THOMAS ASHEY, JUN.

REINACH'S COINS AND HISTORY.

L'histoire par les monnaies. By THEODORE REINACH. Paris (Leroux) 1902. 10 fr.

FOLLOWING a convenient practice, more familiar in France than in England, M. Reinach has gathered together in a volume some of the more important of his numismatic articles that have appeared during the last fifteen years. These articles, however, are not mere reprints but are brought up to date and have in some cases been re-written.

In an introductory essay the writer defines ancient numismatics as 'la science qui étudie et classe les monnaies anciennes en vue de les faire servir à la connaissance de l'histoire,' and he makes a distinction—perhaps, however, not always quite easy to make—between 'pure' and 'applied' numismatics. M. Reinach's own interest, as the title of his book and the bulk of its contents indicate, is chiefly in the latter species of coin-study. The question he is disposed to ask about a coin is what historical fact does it teach us. The question that the collector is rather inclined to ask is how far does my coin differ from any hitherto published. Thus to the collector the discovery that the king's head on his coin 'goes to the right' while all other known heads turn to the left is a matter deemed hardly less important than the finding of a new dynast or a new portrait; and it may be said that his peculiar delight is to make a diabol grow where his predecessors have only cultivated obols.

In his second paper—like the first a Sorbonne lecture—Reinach deals with the invention of coinage and succeeds in treating a familiar theme with considerable freshness, as for instance in his remarks on 'monetary' exchange in Homer and

among the ancient Cretans and Lacedaemonians. The third article, 'La date de Pheidon,' is an argument in favour of the old date—B.C. 748. The *δραχμοί* dedicated by Pheidon in the temple of Hera near Argos are explained as standard specimens of the new system of weights and measures introduced by him. His alleged connexion with the invention of coinage (i.e. the minting of silver money in Aegina) has thus no real foundation. The articles on the proportional value of gold and silver in Greece and on the gold coinage of Sicily are learned and luminous papers which should be serviceable to many besides numismatists. A shorter article deals with the monetary system of Delphi and the local peculiarity (revealed by inscriptions) of the division of the mina into 70 instead of 100 drachms.

An important series of articles is concerned with various points in the regal coinages of Pontus, Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Galatia, and attention should be directed to the revised genealogical table of the dynasty of Mithradates of Pontus as set forth on p. 137. A readable account of the kingdom of Commagene, with a stemma, should also be noticed. M. Reinach is well known to have a peculiar *flair* for the regal coinages of the ancients, and though the Ptolemies, the Seleucids, and the Arsacids have, to some extent, become the (not very inviting) prey of others, he should still be able to throw light on many problems presented by these obscure and difficult coinages. I may mention as a small but not unimportant series that still awaits exhaustive investigation the coinage of the Kings of Persis from the time of the rise of the Arsacids (c. B.C. 250) till the emergence of the Sassanian dynasty in the third century A.D.

Without attempting to summarize the many articles contained in this book, I may say in conclusion that the whole volume is a record of much valuable work and should be of hardly less interest to the historical scholar than to the numismatist.

WARWICK WROTH.

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

Rome.—In the Piazza Colonna a lead water-pipe has been found, bearing the inscription...I PHOEBIANI TRIB CHO PR VIG, i.e. [sub cura]...i Phoebiani, trib(uni)

e(o)ho(rtis) pr(imae) vig(illum). Cf. *C. I. L.* xv. 7245. It is thought that the pipe belongs to a conduit which supplied the barracks of the 1st cohort of *vigiles* with water. Prof. Lanciani, however, combats this view on the ground that the barracks were situated at a considerable distance from the site of the discovery, and would have in any case drawn their water-supply from the Aqua Virgo which was close by them. His idea is that the pipe forms part of an elaborate system of hydrants for the fire-brigade, which were laid down in all parts of the city.

Near the same place a piece of a brick has come to light, which bears a stamp hitherto unpublished: IVVENTI SATVRNINI E(x) F SEI A E S | ISAVRIC OPVS DOLIAE | ASIATICO II COS. Iuventus Saturninus was evidently in 125 A.D. superintendent of one of the brick-kilns belonging to Seia Isaurica. In the *orbiculus* of the stamp is a bust of Mercury to the right with *caduceus* and purse. The position of this figure is unusual, since such designs are nearly always found in the middle of the stamp; a parallel, however, is offered by *C. I. L.* xv. 1095, where a bust of Mars is found in the small eccentric circle.

A portion of the pavement of the Via Flaminia has also been discovered during the present drainage works in the Piazza Colonna; it was found at a depth of 21 feet under the present level.¹

During the restoration of the church of S. Saba on the Aventine a fragmentary inscription has been found, which contains a list of names, each followed by the word *loco*. It bears the date 40 A.D. ([C. Caesa]re iii cos.). By comparing the present list with similar inscriptions previously discovered (*C. I. L.* vi. 1977-1979) we may conclude that we have here a list of fresh members co-opted into the body of the *Salii Palatini*. Among the names given are those of Cornelius Dolabella, Torquatus and Junius Silani, Asinius Marcellus, Pompeius Magnus. Another fragment from a marble *cippus* found in the same place evidently comes from the barracks of the 4th cohort of *vigiles*, which were situated on the Aventine. It was dedicated by soldiers promoted to the rank of *principales*. We find mentioned the grades of *beneficiarius sub praefecti*, *commentariensis praefecti*, *cornicularius praefecti*, and, a new office, that of *tabularius beneficiarii praefecti*.²

¹ Bull. della Comm. Arch., 1902, pp. 192 ff., and *Athenaeum*, Feb. 7th 1903.

² Bull. della Comm. Arch. loc. cit.

Further fragments of an inscription relating to the exploits of Avilius Teres, a famous jockey of the time of Domitian, have been found in the Vatican. Part of the same inscription, discovered previously, had been removed to Florence. All the fragments put together form about half of the whole text, which is in three sections, relating (1) the victories of the rider, (2) the names of the winning horses, and (3) innovations introduced by Avilius Teres in harnessing, method of driving (e.g. *intra funes primum vicit*), etc., together with the names of riders defeated by him, such as Claudius Olympus of the "Greens." Judging from the number of inscriptions of this character found there, the Campus Vaticanus must have been a favourite burying place for jockeys.

A large block of houses near the Forum of Trajan has been levelled to the ground with a view to doubling the extent of the Piazza di Venezia and carrying out other alterations. These operations will probably lead to important archaeological discoveries. Already on the East of the Piazza di Venezia a fine bust of Didia Clara, daughter of the Emperor Didius Julianus (193 A.D.), has been found. This shows that she was not included in the *memoriae damnatio* of her father.³

Via Nomentana.—A piece of the pavement of the old Roman road has been discovered, and near it a large marble *cippus* with the inscription: DIS MANIBVS CLAVDIAE PELAGIAE | TI CLAVDIVS AVG L MOSCHVS LANIP | FILIAE PISSIMAE. Moschus was therefore a freedman of the Emperor Tiberius and held the office of *lanipendius*, whose duty it was to apportion the wool for spinning.⁴

Terni, Umbria.—The remains of a very old Roman fountain have been found here, consisting of a terracotta mask of rough Etruscan workmanship, perhaps intended to represent a head of Neptune. The flesh part was painted red, and the hair and beard green; in the mouth was a hole for the emission of water. The water descended through a small grotto, and the fountain was, even in ancient times, below the level of the cultivated ground, since remains of stone steps, which led down to it, have been discovered.⁴

Florence.—The François vase, which was shattered by a mad attendant in 1900, has been most successfully reconstructed out of thousands of fragments. The restoration

³ *Athenaeum*, 7th Feb.

⁴ *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1902, p. 282.

was greatly facilitated by the fact that Reichold's careful drawing had been made before the catastrophe took place. Unfortunately in the excitement of the moment, a piece of the vase was secured by some person unknown, and this fragment is greatly needed for the complete reconstruction of the vase.⁵

F. H. MARSHALL.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik. Parts 3 and 4, 1902.

H. Gaebler. 'Zur Münzkunde Makedoniens. III. An interesting paper (pp. 141—189) dealing in detail with the history and coinage of Macedonia under Roman rule. An important attribution proposed is the assignment to the rebel Philippos-Andriskos (B.C. 149—148) of some of the silver coins inscribed ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ and hitherto supposed to have been struck by Philip V.

⁵ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, Dec. 27th, 1902.

of Macedon. Gaebler has discovered that specimens of these coins are re-struck on coins that are certainly later than Philip V, and the attribution to Andriskos thus becomes very probable.—K. Regling. 'Zur Griechische Münzkunde II.' Coin of *Philippopolis* in Thrace of Geta with the interesting inscription IC Ε[Ω]ΝΑ (eis alōna) ΤΟΥΣ ΚΥΡΙΟΥΣ ΕΠ Α[ΓΑ]ΘΩ ΤΗ ΜΗ[Τ]ΡΟΠΟΛΙ ΦΙ- [Λ]ΙΠΠΟΠ[ΟΛΙ]. A coin of Gorgion dynast of *Gambrium* in Mysia. ΠΑΝΙΩΝΙΟΣ an epithet of Artemis on an Ephesian coin of Severus Alexander (cp. the Πανιώνια). *Hermupolis*. There is no numismatic or other authority for the existence of a supposed Lydian town of this name. *Siocharax* in Phrygia; coins of Geta and J. Donna.

Revue Numismatique. Part 4, 1902.

J. Rouvier. 'Les rois Phéniciens de Sidon d'après leurs monnaies sous la dynastie des Achéménides' (5th and 4th cent. B.C.).—J. Foville. 'Monnaies trouvées en Crète.' Some varieties of coins of Eleutherna, Lyttus, Polyrhénion, &c.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. 26, 4, 1902.

M. Beadounin. *Notes critiques sur les Lettres d'Alciphron*. With reference to Schepers' edition. H de la Ville de Mirmont, *La 'Nenia'* II. *Nenia* denoted originally the primitive funeral chant. Being misunderstood in course of time it came to be the despised name of magic formulae. In Gallo-Roman times the old name of *Nenia* was given to panegyrics in honour of the dead. L. Parmentier, *Soph. O. T.* 10, 11. Takes στρέφω as = 'having filial affection' not 'desiring.' L. Parmentier, *L'adjectif ἐξάντης* (Plat. *Phaedr.* 244 E). On the alleged derivation from ἐξ ἑτης. H. Bornecque, *Le texte de Sénèque le père*. A. Misier, *Les manuscrits parisiens de Grégoire de Nazianze* (continued). A. Cartault, *Sur Tibulle*. On various passages. F. Gaffiot, *Études Latines I, A propos de quelques locutions fixes*. On *Quid est quod, Ut qui, Praesertim cum*.

Hermes. Vol. 37, 2, 1902.

P. Jahn, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* *Ecl.* x. 43b-64 and 69 may contain several resemblances to Gallus. The composer of the *Ciris* was not Gallus, but a later poet, who was quite acquainted with Virgil's Eclogues and Georgics. K. Schmidt, *Die griechischen Personennamen bei Plautus. I.* A collection of names that are found in Greece or that only differ from such by their termination. W. Crönert, *Philias von Kos*. To prove that Φιλίας, not Φιλήτας, is the correct form. C. Vick, *Karneades' Kritik der Theologie bei Cicero und Sextus Empiricus*. Seeks to determine what is really attributable to Carneades in *Cic. N. D.* iii, and where the authority of Cicero is to be preferred to *Sextus adv. math.* ix. 137 foll. W. Dürpfeld, *Thymele und Skene*. Against Bethe's article in the last vol. Θυμέλη is the altar itself or its base (πρόθυσις) in the centre of the orchestra, on which in the earliest

period the actors had their place, then it became a name for the whole orchestra. After the σκηνή (the house forming the back ground) was introduced, representations in which this was the central point were called 'scenic,' and all other 'thymelic.' F. Studniczka, *Eine Corruptel im Ion des Euripides*. Suggests in l. 223 ἀμφὶ τε γοργῶ <χρυσοφαίνω Διὸς οὐανῶ>. J. Schöne, *Zur notitia dignitatum*. Maintains that the cod. *Siprentis* or rather its last archetype is composed from the *Notitia dignitatum per Orientem*, and the *Not. dig. per Occidentem*. E. Bethe, *Die Zeit des Heauton Timorumenos und des Kolax Menanders*. The former is one of the earliest and the latter one of the latest comedies. K. Prächter, *Zur Frage nach der Composition der sechsten Rede des Dion Chrysostomos*. Maintains the separation of §§ 1-7 from the rest of the speech. G. Knaack, *Encheiromastores*. Rejects Tümpel's interpretation as = *Polypi*. W. Dittenberger, *Ἐλαφίστι- κτος* (*Lyrics* xiii. 19). This is not a proper name but an adj. = *ελαφον ἐστιγμένος*. U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Lesefrüchte*. A number of passages in Greek and Latin authors considered. F. Leo, *viso vidi*. The last is the perfect in use of *viso*. Th. Preger, *Noch einmal die Gründung Constantinopels*. The change of name from Byzantium was in 324 or 325. The official beginning of the elevation of rank of the city was 26 Nov. 328. C. Robert, *Alektryon*. The figure, not hitherto correctly explained, upon a lately-discovered Pompeian wall-painting is *Alektryon*, the watchman of Ares.

Part 3. U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Lesefrüchte*. Several passages in Greek authors discussed. C. Oestergaard, *Διάκροπος Ἀργειφόντης*. Explains *διάκροπος* as = *διὰ φθόρος* and refers the phrase not to *Hermes* but to an earlier god of Light 'one who kills with beams of light.' Th. Thalheim, *Zur Eisangelie in Athen*. To show that the notion of *εἰσαγγελία* has a wider meaning than is generally thought. K. Schmidt, *Die griechischen Personennamen*

bei *Plautus II.* Gives a list of names which are words in Greek but not proper names. L. Ziehen, *Ὀβλοχόται*. Maintains that *Ὀβλ.* had a cathartic meaning and had no connexion with the rites of animal sacrifice. A. Gercke, *Die Überlieferung des Diogenes Laertios*. Concludes that the codd. BFP are sufficient for the reconstruction of an archetype. The greater completeness of Book 7 does not justify us in assuming an old tradition for the vulgate, for the completeness is due to interpolations. J. Kirchner, *Zu den attischen Archonten des III. Jahrhunderts*. Gives a list of Archons on the authority of a fragment of Apollodorus, which is not consistent with the order given by Beloch. Th. Mommsen, *Sallustius=Salutius und das Signum*. We must distinguish between Flavius Sallustius praefectus praetorio of the Gauls and Saturninus Secundus with the by-name Salutius, prefect of the East. The word *signum* is explained from inscriptions of the imperial time in the sense of personal designation. The *signum* differs from *nomen* and *cognomen* as being grammatically distinct from the name, e.g. *M. Aurelius Oenopio Onesimus signo Acaci*. After the fourth century the distinction between *signum* and *nomen* vanished. F. Blass, *Die Berliner Fragmente der Sappho*. Gives the text and explanations. H. Diels, *Onomatologisches*. Maintains the monophthongic writing of *Παμπερίδης* and explains the word *λιγυαστάδης* referring to Mimnermus in Solon ap. Diog. I. 61. W. Dörpfeld, *Zur Tholos von Epidaurus*. Arguing from the analogy of Delphi, maintains that the round basis at Epidaurus is not a *puteal*, but can only have been an altar. W. Sternkopf, *Zu Cicero Phil. xiii. § 38*—In the letter of Antonius reads *difficile est credere eosque, qui etc.*

P. Stengel, *Vogelzug*. Finds in the inser. Dittenberger Syll.² 792 a confirmation of the old belief that a bird seen on the left is a bad omen. M. Ihm, *Zu Suetons Vita Lucani*. On the hemistich of the emperor Nero.

Part 4. M. Krascheninnikov, *De Gitanis Epiri oppido*. In *Polyb.* xxvii. 16. 5 and *Liv.* xlii. 38. 1, *Gitana* is correctly handed down, the modern *Dhélvinon* in Epirus. M. Manitius, *Aus der Dresdener Hyginhandschrift*. Gives important readings with an estimate of their value for the text. Br. Keil, *Von delphischem Rechnungswesen*. On the value of money at Delphi about 300 B.C. from the inscriptions published in *B.C.H.* 1900, xxiv. 463–483. H. Schrader, *Telephos der Pergamener* *πρὸ τῆς καθ' Ὀμηρον ἡντορικῆς*. This writing seems to have been the common source of Pa.-Plut. *πρὸ Ὀμήρου*, Pa.-Dion. Hal. *τέχνη*, the Porphyrian *ζήτηματα* and Homer-scholia, in part also of the Hermogenescholia. A. Körte, *Das Mitgliederverzeichnis einer attischen Phratie*. On an inser. published in the *Εφην.* ἀρχ. 1901, 157, foll. as evidence of the dwindling of the Phraties. M. Ihm, *Beiträge zur Textgeschichte des Sueton*. On the worthlessness of three 'humanist' codd., and of the Monacensis, a copy of the Gudianus. G. Knaack, *Zur Sage von Dauidalos und Ikuros*. On this legend as represented by Euripides and Callimachus. K. Schmidt, *Die griechischen Personennamen bei Plautus III.* The small number of purely Greek names in Plautus is evidence of the independent growth of an Italo-Greek popular consciousness. O. Kern, *Votivreliefs der thessalischen Magneten*. C. F. Lehmann, *Zu den thessalischen Gewichten*. F. Bechtel, *Zur Inschrift des Sotairos*.

CORRIGENDUM.

In *C.R.* for February, p. 79, col. 2, l. 2, for 'Mr. Mairs' read 'Mr. Monro.